GOPAL (L.)

1962.

Ph.D.

(Medieval Indian History)

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

THE ECONOMIC LIFE OF NORTHERN INDIA C. A.D. 700-1200

by

LALLANJI GOPAL

School of Oriental and African Studies

Thesis presented for the degree of the Doctorate of Philosophy

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

June, 1962.

A B S T R A C T

In chapter I we survey the main currents of the political history, the work so far done on our subject and the important sources which we use.

Chapter II - There were supporters of both peasant-proprietorship and state ownership of land, but the claims of the state were increasing, and the feudal chief was emerging as a third claimant. In some parts of northern India a quasi-manorial system had grown up.

In chapter III we analyse the revenue terms in the land-grants and try to determine their precise meaning.

Chapter IV discusses the increase in the number of slaves, and the definite lowering in their status, and the effect of feudal polity and of Muslims on slavery.

Chapter V - There was a general weakening in the organisation and economic importance of guilds, which were fossilising into sub-castes.

Chapter VI deals with inter-state contacts and trade, the organisation of caravan journeys and transport, the condition of roads, river traffic, and the decline in the volume of trade in this period.

We discuss foreign trade in two chapters, in VII in relation to overland routes, and in VIII, in a wider context, the decline of Indian shipping and its reasons, Indian ports, imports and exports, and the volume and balance of trade.

In Chapter IX we consider money-lending, the use of letters of credit and banking institutions.

Chapter X deals with the weight-standard of the coins, the identification of coin-names, and the prevalence of a money economy, the relative value of metals, and the right to mint coins.

In chpater XI we discuss the periodisation of Indian history, the standard of living in the period, the causes responsible for poverty, the baneful influence of feudalism, and the stages in the history of India's economic decline.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have great pleasure in acknowledging the help which I have received from several people in the preparation of the present thesis. I am indebted to the scholars whose works I have used and have acknowledged in suitable foot-notes. I have received valuable guidance on a few chapters of my thesis from Dr.J.G.de Casparis. Dr.J.D.M.Derrett kindly discussed with me some points in my article on the Śukranīti. Above all I have to acknowledge my sincere indebtedness to my revered teacher Prof.A.L.Basham.

I shall be failing in my duty if I do not acknowledge my indebtedness to the British Council whose scholarship I enjoyed in 1960-61. The staff of the libraries of the S.O.A.S., R.A.S., British Museum and India Office also extended me a helping hand.

I take this opportunity to clarify a few points about my thesis. For want of space I have not discussed all the diverse aspects of economic life of the period, but have confined myself to those which have been neglected or not adequately dealt with in existing works. In the chapter on sea-trade, of necessity, I have had to discuss some points which do not appear to be directly concerned with northern India. There is no account of the sea-trade of the period emphasising Indian evidence and so I have attempted it, because the role of coastal regions of northern India cannot be appreciated unless one keeps in mind the overall picture.

ABBREVIATIONS

A.I.N.	Ancient Indian Numismatics. By D.R.Bhandarkar.
A.I.O.C.	Proceedings and Transactions of All-India Oriental Conference.
A.S.R.	Archaeological Survey of India, Reports by Sir A. Cunningham.
A.S.S.	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series.
B.E.F.E.O.	Bulletin de l' École Française d' Extrême Orient, Hanoi.
B.G.	Bombay Gazetteer.
B.I.	Bibliotheca Indica.
B.K.I.	Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, land en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië.
B.S.	Bṛhatsaṃhitā.
C.C.I.M.	Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta
C.I.I.	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.
C.M.I.	Coins of Mediaeval India. By A.Cunningham.
D.H.N.I.	Dynastic History of Northern India. By H.C. Ray.
E.I.	Epigraphia Indica.
H.R.S.	Contributions to the History of Hindu Revenue System. By U.N.Ghoshal.

I.A.	Indian Antiquary.
I.B.	Inscriptions of Bengal.
I.C.	Indian Culture.
I.H.Q.	Indian Historical Quarterly.
J.A.	Journal Asiatique.
J.A.H.R.S.	Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society.
J.A.O.S.	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
J.A.S.B.	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
J.B.B.R.A.S.	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.B.O.R.S.	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.
J.D.L.	Journal of the Department of Letters.
J.E.S.H.O.	Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.
J.I.H.	Journal of Indian History.
J.M.B.R.A.S.	Journal of the Malaya Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.
J.N.S.I.	Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.
J.O.I.	Journal of the Oriental Institute.
J.R.A.S.	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.
J.R.G.S.	Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London.

J.U.P.H.S.	Journal of the U.P. Historical Society.
K.S.S.	Kathāsaritsāgara.
M.A.S.B.	Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Mbh.	Mahābhārata.
N.S.P.	Nirṇaya Sāgara Press.
Num. Chron.	Numismatic Chronicle.
P.I.H.C.	Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.
Proc.Beng.A.S.	Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Rāj.	Rājataraṅgiṇī.
S.I.I.	South Indian Inscriptions.
S.I.S.	Sino-Indian Studies.
Yāj.	Yājñavalkyasmṛti.

C O N T E N T S

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

The unique importance of the period under study consists in the fact that it links ancient to medieval India and sheds light on both by a sort of dehalī-dīpaka-nyāya.[1] It represents the culmination and degeneration of the classical traditions of ancient Indian culture and thus its study is important for determining the causes which sapped the vitality of Indians and rendered their resistance to the Muslim invaders surprisingly weak. On the other side, in order to have a proper understanding of the origins and true nature of the polity under the Turko-Afghan Sultans one cannot ignore the institutions of the early medieval period. The Turko-Afghan rulers had as a matter of necessity to use much of the machinery of administration already in existence.

But the attention which this period has received from scholars of Indian history has not been proportionate to its importance. Like a man with two wives it has to face the scornful neglect of the historians alike of ancient and medieval periods of Indian history. Many x historians of ancient India have not bothered to follow the course of events after the decline of the Guptas or in any case after the reign of Harṣa.

---

1. The maxim that a lamp placed on the threshold illumines both the interior and the exterior of a house.

On the other hand historians of medieval India have often concentrated on the period beginning with the establishment of the power of the Mamlūk Sultans and have paid little attention to Sanskrit sources, which most of them were not competent to handle.

Ignorance as to the true historical details of the period explains the misconceptions which can be seen in earlier works on the period. Thus V.A.Smith described Harṣa as the last emperor in the history of ancient India, after whom it is only a confused story of "a medley of petty states, with ever-varying boundaries and engaged in unceasing internecine war"[1]. Such a view implies an utter misunderstanding of the history of the early medieval period, the imperial ambitions of the important dynasties and, above all, the extent of the Pratihāra kingdom, which at its height covered a larger area than could possibly be claimed by an eulogist of Harṣa.[2]

With a view to appraise correctly any aspect of social life we have to keep in mind the frame-work of the political history of the period. We can easily trace two dominant threads in the

---

1. Early History of India, p.370. See also ibid., pp.371, 372.
2. R.C.Majumdar, The Gurjara-Pratihāras in J.D.L., X pp.1-76; The Age of Imperial Kanauj, p.39.

fabric of the political history. The period can be studied from the view-point either of the attempt of the native powers to achieve imperial glory, or of the gradual establishment of the political power of Islam. The death of Harṣa created a temporary vacuum on the political stage and there followed several attempt on the part of different kings and dynasties to establish their political supremacy. In the earlier part of the period Kanauj had come to receive some sort of an imperial halo and was the most coveted prize for those participating in the contest for imperial supremacy. At the beginning of our period we find Yaśovarman ruling over Kanauj. With Lalitāditya Kashmir also entered into the arena of the politics of north India. Tibet also seems to have attempted to gain hegemony over some parts of north India. It is not unlikely that the activities of Kashmir and Tibet reflect the greater struggle for the control of the trade between the East and West fought on a larger scale in Central Asia.[1]

But soon north Indian politics came to be dominated by the tripartite struggle for supremacy among the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Pālas and the Pratihāras. Though both the Pālas and the Pratihāras had alternate moments of rejoicing, the Pālas established

---

1. See infra pp. 175-77.

their dominance over almost the whole of north India only under Dharmapāla and Devapāla. The Pratihāras no doubt achieved the zenith of their power during the reigns of Bhoja and Mahendrapāla, but they long enjoyed the position of the chief imperial power in north India. The struggle between the Pratihāras and the Pālas was intercepted by the occasional outburst of the military might of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, whose armies at least on three occasions, under Dhruva, Govinda III and Indra III, overran northern India. But they do not seem to have attempted a serious and lasting occupation of the conquered areas, and were satisfied merely to force the defeated kings to accept their temporary subjugation. The attempted thrust of the Arabs of Sind towards Gujarat, the victories over the Arabs claimed for some of the Pratihāra kings, the feeling of animosity towards Islam which the Arab geographers ascribe to the Pratihāra kings and the sympathetic and patronising attitude of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings towards the Arabs make a good case for the view that the struggle in northern India may well be described as a quadrangular one. Obviously the desire for martial glory and imperial supremacy was the dominant motive force behind this struggle. But the participation of the Arabs would suggest that the concern for economic gains was also to some extent an important reason.

About the middle of the tenth century the Pratihāra empire disintegrated and gradually came to be confined to Kanauj and its neighbourhood. The history of the eleventh century is dominated by a number of states which had started their careers as the feudatories of the Pratihāras. These include the Cāhamānas in Rajasthan, the Caulukyas in Gujarat and the Paramāras in Malwa. Other important dynasties which participated in the imperial game were the Gāhaḍavālas, the Candellas and the Kalacuris. The history of the period is a record of continuous rivalry among these kingdoms, without any lasting success for any one of them. Besides these there were other smaller states. This political fragmentation sapped the vitality of the country and rendered it incapable of putting up an effective and combined resistance to the Muslim invaders.

The period under study can be described as forming the necessary background for the establishment of Muslim power in India. Here also we can point out several stages in this process. The Arabs conquered Sind in 712 A.D. but their attempts to occupy other interior areas were utterly unsuccessful. The Muslim state in Sind had a precarious existence, often threatened by the might of the Pratihāras. The Arab occupation was only an episode, of no importance to other parts of the country; for

the narrative of the establishment of Muslim authority it is equally without much real value. The final conquest of northern India was effected by Muslim armies that came through the north-western frontiers. The period roughly before 1000 A.D. was one of successful resistance to Muslim invaders. The Muslims, however, never gave up the idea of extending their victorious arms to India. For over two hundred years they had continuously to hammer against the petty states of Kabul and Zabul, which offered stubborn and heroic resistance before they went down to the greatest military power of their times. The slow progress of the arms of Islam, which had brought under its mantle a considerable part of three continents, redounds to the credit of these two states. The next stage in this connection is marked by the date 997, when Mahmūd, son of Sabuktigīn, captured Ghazni and turned his attention to India. His conquests established Muslim power over Punjab, which thus served as the spring-board for the complete success of the Muslims. Even then the Muslims had to wait for some two hundred years until in 1193 A.D. Mu'izz-ud-dīn Ghūrī defeated Pṛthvīrāja Cāhamāna in the battle of Tarain. Now there was nothing to stop the onrush of the Muslims and the year 1206 witnessed the establishment of the

Mamlūk dynasty.

x x x x x x x x

There has been no serious attempt to delineate the economic life of northern India in the early medieval period. The over-emphasis by earlier Indologists on political and religious history had led to the neglect of social history in general and economic life in particular. Two early works on economic life in ancient India[1] do not pay much attention to the medieval period as they concentrate on the period upto the Guptas or Harṣa. They suffer from the absence of a developmental attitude, being content merely to catalogue the references. Since these works were produced a number of important texts bearing on different aspects of economic life of the period under study have been brought out. Above all these works totally neglect the epigraphic records.

In his work A Study in the Economic Condition of Ancient India[2] Pran Nath lumps together evidence pertaining to different periods of Indian history. The book is sketchy in the sense that it concentrates only on a few sources, of which hardly any is a regular text of our period. His methods and interpretation also leave much to be desired.

In continuation of his Dynastic History of Northerrn India

---

1. N.S.Subba Rao, Economic and Political Conditions in Ancient India; S.K.Das, Economic History of Ancient India.

H.C.Ray had proposed in 1931 to present an account of the economic life of northern India in the early medieval period. With his profound knowledge of the vast source material for the period he is eminently fitted to undertake such a study. It is regrettable that he has not been able to do so after so many years. Some of the books on the early medieval period also discuss the economic life. By way of illustration we may mention the History of Mediaeval Hindu India by C.V.Vaidya. But the treatment is sketchy. The Age of Imperial Kanauj and the Struggle for Empire, two volumes in the series The History and Culture of the Indian People, which cover the period we are investigating, have each a section on economic life. But as of necessity these accounts are brief and preclude a detailed and thorough analysis.

Of late there have been many good books on the history of individual dynasties and regions of northern India in our period. Some of these like the History of Bengal edited by R.C.Majumdar, the Chaulukyas of Gujarat by A.K.Majumdar and the Early Chauhān Dynasties by D.Sharma have attempted a detailed analysis of the economic conditions from their respective source material. Such works have their own advantages but they often tend to lose sight of the overall situation and hence the need for a compact

account for northern India as a whole.

Recently B.P.Mazumdar has brought out his work on the Socio-Economic History of Northern India from 1030 to 1194 A.D. Such a vertical study has an intrinsic advantage in that it provides an opportunity for a thorough analysis of the limited source material. But the fact cannot be overlooked that in the case of institutions of earlier times, when there is a dearth of precise references, it is better to undertake a horizontal study. It is strange that Mazumdar's work, though having a predominantly economic emphasis, ~~it~~ omits all references to trade and commerce in the period, both inland and foreign.

We may take a note of some monographs on specific topics connected with economic life. Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System by U.N.Ghoshal is a good survey of the epigraphic evidence. But this needs to be supplemented by literary references and needs bringing up-to-date. Several revenue terms occurring in the land-grants of the period were left unexplained by Ghoshal, while some others need re-consideration. Sārthavāha by Motīcandra, which deals with trade activity in general in ancient times, surveys literary evidence, including foreign accounts, bearing on our period. But it does not attempt to coordinate them and present a connected account.

x x x x x x x

As compared with the earlier periods of Indian history, our period is very rich in source material, both literary and epigraphic. We find valuable incidental references even in works which apparently have no connection with economic life.

It is not only in respect of volume but also of precision that the works of our period excel those of the earlier periods. No doubt we do not have a work of the nature and importance of the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya, but specialised works on several aspects of economic life are not wanting. On agricultural science we have valuable evidence in the Kṛṣiparāśara and the sayings circulating in the name of Khanā. There are several works dealing with elephants and horses[1] and many Tantric texts of the period deal with mineralogy and alchemy[2]. Likewise there are a few texts on jewels[3], and certain medical works[4] reveal considerable advance in the preparation of metallic compounds and the knowledge of vegetable and mineral substances. Certain

---

1. E.g., the Mātaṅgalīlā of Nārāyaṇa, the Hastyāyurveda, the Aśvāyurveda of Gaṇa, the Aśvaśāstra of Śālihotra, the Aśva-vaidyaka of Jayadatta and Dīpaṅkara, and the Aśvacikitsā of Nakula.
2. E.g., the Rasaratnākara of Nāgārjuna, the Rasārṇava and the Rasaratnasamuccaya. See P.C.Ray, History of Chemistry, pp. 128ff; B.K.Sarkar, Positive Background, pp.70ff, 87-90.
3. E.g., the Agastimata, the Ratnaparīkṣā of Buddha Bhaṭṭa and the Naveratnaparīkṣā of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita.
4. E.g., the Cikitsāsārasaṅgraha, Śabdacandrikā and Dravyaguṇa-saṃgraha of Cakrapāṇidatta and the Śabdapradīpa, Vṛkṣāyurveda and Lohapaddhati of Sureśvara.

works which are still to be published give interesting information on some of the crafts and industries of the period. Among these are the Gandhasāra of Gaṅgadhara and the Gandhavāda, ~~are~~ two treatises on cosmetics and perfumery.[1]

Sections on agriculture, botany, cattle-rearing and the making of various articles are to be found in the Śārṅgadhara-paddhati, an anthology compiled by Śārṅgadhara in about 1363 A.D. The Yuktikalpataru ascribed to Bhoja and the Mānasollāsa by the Western Cālukya king Someśvara are in the nature of compendia of topics which are supposed to be of interest and advantage to a prince. These contain interesting and informative sections on jewels, furniture, cattle-rearing and horticulture. Similar sections were incorporated into the Agni Purāṇa and the Garuḍa Purāṇa.

For lack of space however we have not discussed in our present thesis the technological aspects of the economic life of the period under study.

For our purposes we have thoroughly analysed the epigraphic records of the period. Without entering into a discussion of the merits of the inscriptions as a source for the ancient history of India, we may say that the absence of any serious

---

1. P.K.Gode, Studies in Indian Literary History, Vol.III pp. 1ff.

doubt about the reading, their contemporanity and the certainty about their date make them the most reliable source of historical information for our period. Besides incidental references on many subjects, we find the inscriptions especially valuable for the agrarian system, the revenue system, the use of coins, guilds and economic occupations, and the movement of population.

The over-emphasis on the coins of the earlier periods has resulted in a sad neglect of those of early medieval times. These are yet to be properly catalogued, analysed and studied. It was in 1894 that Cunningham's Coins of Mediaeval India was published. Since then, except for a few short articles, there has been no systematic study of the coins of the period. The Dravyaparīkṣā of Ṭhakkura Pheru can serve as a valuable clue in analysing and identifying the coins of the period but the text has not been published as yet and we had to depend on stray references to some of its contents made by the few scholars who have had an access to its single available manuscript.

Excavations at some of the sites in northern India provide significant material. But unfortunately the archaeologist does not pay much attention to the strata of this period, busy as he is in fixing the chronology for earlier levels. Excavations may yield valuable evidence for city economy in general, for those crafts and industries the products of which do not perish

with time, and for the effects of wars and foreign invasions. It is hoped that in future the excavations at sites such as Kanauj and Banaras will take due notice of the remains belonging to the early medieval strata.

Our period is equally rich in foreign accounts. Among the Chinese sources the best known is the work of Chau Ju-kua, which preserves valuable information about the sea-trade in the period and the articles involved in this trade. The very nature of his work, however, rules out detailed references to different parts of northern India.

The Arab accounts are valuable for their evidence on the condition of trade, both overland and by sea, and give details about the economic life of different cities, ports and kingdoms. They help us in determining the important land-routes inside the country. The greatest of the Arab travellers, Al-Bīrūnī does not interest himself much in the economic life of the times. Much of his information on this subject is based on traditional accounts. He was too engrossed in the literature and culture of India to record the details of contemporary life from personal observation. But he describes the existing trade-routes in northern India. The Persian work Ḥudūd al-'Ālam is often neglected in a study of the early medieval period. For an economic study it is especially important. It refers to the products of

the different cities, their importance as centres of trade and commerce, and also to the overland trade of India across the north-western frontiers. Some incidental information is also to be gathered from the Muslim accounts of the early Muslim conquest in northern India.

Among indigenous literary texts we would like to mention in the first instance the Śukranīti because it contains much refreshingly singular information on labour laws, revenue system, comparative value of metals and several economic occupations. Most scholars use this text for the early medieval period. We have definite indications to show that it is a nineteenth century composition. Our arguments for this view are to be published elsewhere.[1]

The commentary by Medhātithi on the Manusmṛti is an important source for our period. By way of illustration, and sometimes in opposition to the laws of Manu, Medhātithi refers to the practices of his times. At places his commentary liberalises the injunctions in the original text. We have thoroughly studied the commentary and found much new and interesting

---

1. Our article "The Śukranīti - a nineteenth century text" has been accepted for Vol. XXV Part 3 (October, 1962) of the Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies. We are attaching with the thesis a typed copy of this article.

information in it.

The Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara, the minister for peace and war of king Govindacandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty, is in the form of a digest. But we can easily deduce the views held by the author from the particular passages which he selects for emphasis from the earlier works and also from the short commentary which he adds at places.

Among other legal texts used by us we may mention the Nītivākyāmṛta of Somadeva and the Rājanītiratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara. We have also referred, for the sake of comparison, to some legal texts which are outside the chronological and geographical limits of our present study. By way of illustration we may mention the commentaries of Aparārka, Vijñāneśvara, Devaṇṇabhaṭa and Mādhavācārya (known as the Parāśaramādhavīya).

In recent decades Purāṇic studies have advanced considerably through the researches of Prof. R.C.Hazra. But still much remains to be done before we can safely use the material in the Purāṇas. There have been several accretions to the original Purāṇas with the result that the stratification of the Purāṇic texts is very difficult to determine. We have therefore chiefly used only two Purāṇas, the Agni Purāṇa, which is generally accepted as a text of the early medieval period, and the Bṛhan-

nāradīya Purāṇa, which seems to refer to the Muslims.

The literary texts used by us are too many even to be enumerated. Interesting incidental references are to be found even in the least expected ones, e.g., the Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī which is a philosophical text of the Sāṅkhya school of thought. We can therefore mention only a few of the most important works.

The Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa is a veritable mine of information not only for political history but also for social and cultural history in general. We have many valuable references to the economic life of Kashmir, to the crops, the irrigational devices, the life of villagers, the political and natural calamities affecting the fortunes of cultivators, the revenue system, the use of coins, the activities of merchants and bankers and the rise of a landed aristocracy. Other historical works of the period do not possess such a wide canvas for pictures from different fields of life and have not therefore proved so useful. More important among these are the Dvyāśrayakāvya of Hemacandra, the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandin, Pṛthvīrājavijaya of Jayānaka and the Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Bilhaṇa. The Moharājaparājaya of Yaśaḥpāla, though connected with a historical king, in the person of king Kumārapāla of the Caulukya dynasty,and with some of his administrative reforms,is an

allegorical play. This text speaks of the opulence of the big merchants of Gujarat.

Two important prose romances of the period are the Tilakamañjarī of the Śvetāmbara Jain Dhanapāla, who wrote under the Paramāra king Muñja Vākpatirāja, and the Udayasundarīkathā (c.1026-1050 A.D.) of Soḍḍhala. Fashioned after the works of Bāṇa, these texts contain graphic descriptions, some of which are important for the study of the economic life. Of the two the Tilakamañjarī is more useful for our purposes. It has vivid descriptions of a habitation of cowherds and the stir caused in a village by an army on march. It graphically describes a naval expedition to Dvīpāntara and gives interesting information about Indian shipping and trade with south-east Asia.

Some of the stories in the narrative texts of our period give us some insight into the life of a cultivator, cowherd or a merchant. Of these we have used the anonymous Kathākoṣa and the Bṛhatkathākośa of Hariṣeṇa. In using the Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva and the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra one can utilise only the incidental details and references. As these works are based on the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, any inference from material forming part of the original subject matter of the story will be applicable rather to earlier times than to ours.

The Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita is a Jain text in the form of stories of 63 eminent persons in Jain history and tradition. Besides interesting incidental references on different aspects of economic life, it has a graphic account of a trade journey of a caravan. Jain works contain important references to economic life, especially those aspects which concern a merchant or trader. The Apabhraṃśa romance Bhavisayattakahā by the Digambara Jain Dhanapāla is the story of a merchant who rises to become the ruler of a kingdom. Here we find references not only to caravan journeys to other regions, but also to voyages to south-east Asian islands. The Samarāiccakahā of Haribhadra is an Apabhraṃśa text which describes the cycle of nine lives through which the hero Samarāditya passes but also contains other stories to illustrate or corroborate certain points. Most of these stories, including the central tale, concern merchants, and hence contain interesting references to trade and commerce. The Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā of Siddharṣi is a Jain text in Sanskrit presented in the form of allegories. It is a very valuable text on a number of economic activities. We have made a thorough study of it and used its evidence suitably.

Many authentic historical details are preserved as traditions in Jain works such as the Purātana-prabandha-saṅgraha and

Merutuṅga's Prabandhacintāmaṇi. Some of these traditional stories in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi concern merchants, villagers and craftsmen, and have interesting details about economic life. The Jain text Kharataragacchapaṭṭāvali is equally important for such a study and has greater historical authenticity, as it is in the nature of a record of contemporary events and was added to from time to time.

Among the literary compositions of our period in northern India we may refer to the works of Śrī-Harṣa, Rājaśekhara and Kṣemendra. Many works are ascribed to Kṣemendra, but the Lokaprakāśa and Nītikalpataru can only be used with reservations, because they have been elaborated in subsequent centuries. Kṣemendra specialises in presenting sharply outlined pictures of the important characters of his contemporary society from which we can learn much about merchant-bankers and petty local officers. His Samayamātṛkā, Narmamālā, Darpadalana, Deśopadeśa and Kalā-vilāsa present such satirical cross-sections of society. In his Sevyasevakopadeśa he speaks of the relations between a master and his servant. The Kuṭṭanīmata of Dāmodara concerns courtesans but has interesting references to the life of a typical petty officer and the benefits of and difficulties involved in travelling.

The anthology, first published as the Kavīndravacanasamuccaya by F.W.Thomas but later shown by D.D.Kosambi to have really been the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa of Vidyākara, has many characteristic descriptions of rural life. The Dohākośa of the Siddhas of later Buddhism is in Apabhraṃśa in Dohā verses. In it we find interesting casual references to the profession of a boatman, to cultivators, to poverty and to the use of cowries.

We have alsom analysed the lexica of the period for the terms connected with economic life. Of these the Vaijayantī of Yādava Prakāśa mentions the names of those foreign countries and islands which were known to its author. The names of certain commodities indicate the country from where India received them. The Deśīnāmamāla of Hemacandra gives deśī terms for several important things connected with economic life and thus clearly indicates that these really existed in the period and were in frequent use by the common man. Other lexica used by us are the Abhidhānaratnamālā of Halāyudha, the Abhidhānacintāmaṇi of Hemacandra and the Nāmamālā. The Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa of Dāmodara Paṇḍita illustrates its grammatical rules with sentences about things which were supposed to be well known to a young student. It has very interesting references about several aspects of economic life and we have for the first time used

the text for a study such as this. Likewise the Prākṛta-Vyākaraṇa of Hemacandra has some useful casual references in its illustrations.

Among t/echnical texts we may refer to the Aparājitapṛcchā of Bhuvanadeva and the Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra of Bhoja. In the latter text however the author seems to have given a free rein to his imagination, as would appear from the accounts for aeroplanes and machines guarding the gates of a fort. A mythical element is also found in the Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja, which otherwise has interesting details on polity, on making of furniture and other articles, and on industrial geography. The Mānasollāsa of the Western Cālukya king Someśvara is more balanced and authentic in its details. We have used this text even though it is not within the strict geographical limits of our study, because we do not envisage much radical difference in the basic facts of the economic life of the Cālukya kingdom and northern India.

We have for the first time emphasised the importance of mathematical texts for an economic study. These contain valuable material about the use of coins, prices, wages and other such aspects of economic life for which we do not find much help from other sources. No doubt such texts use figures to

suit their calculations and sometimes imagine them, but it is obvious that in such cases the mathematician would not create absurd situations for the student. We have therefore used the Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha of Mahāvīrācārya and the Līlāvatī and Bījagaṇita of Bhāskarācārya.

CHAPTER II - OWNERSHIP OF LAND

On the vexed question of the ownership of land in ancient India there is a sharp division of opinion among scholars.[1] We have shown elsewhere[2] that even in ancient times there was no unanimity of opinion on this point. Those who advocated state ownership of land were in a minority, by no means insignificant, and the view of peasant-proprietorship was more favoured. For all practical purposes the peasant was the owner of the land. The king, as the sovereign lord of everything in his state, had some claim over the land and received from the peasant a revenue as the wages for the protection he afforded to the people; but all this did not amount to a proprietary right over the land.

In the early medieval legal texts we find a definite notion of ownership. There was a discussion about the nature of ownership as to whether it is a separate category (padārtha) or a capacity.[3] Likewise there was a sharp difference of opinion about the question whether ownership is to be apprehended from Śāstra alone or is a matter of worldly usage. The first view is advocated by the Smṛtisaṅgraha and Dhāreśvara while the latter suggestion is supported by the Mitākṣarā, the Vyavahāra-

---

1. J.E.S.H.O., IV p.240.
2. Ibid., pp.257ff.
3. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.547.

prakāśa, the Vyavahāra-mayūkha, the Parāśara-mādhavīya and the Sarasvatīvilāsa.[1]

The treatment of the question in the texts of this period is mostly conditioned by the views of earlier authorities. We do not find any independent thinking on the subject; it is largely in the form of elaboration and interpretation of earlier texts. The Mīmāṃsā view as originally stated by Jaimini[2] is that the earth equally belongs to all. Śabara-svāmin[3] in his commentary emphasises the distinction betweem the entire territory of the state and the private fields, the former being incapable of individual ownership and adds that by virtue of his protecting the crops that grow on the earth the king is entitled to a share of them as his remuneration but not to the lordship of the soil. These very points, the distinction of private and common property and the functional nature of sovereignty, were emphasised even by Mādhava[4] and Khaṇḍadeva[5], two Mīmāṃsā commentators belonging respectively to the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries. But all this argumentation by the Mīmāṃsā thinkers itself is a silent recognition that the claims

---

1. Ibid., 548-51.
2. Mīmāṃsā-sūtra, VI.7.3.
3. Mīmāṃsā-darśana, VI.7.3.
4. Nyāyamālāvistara (A.S.S.), p.358.
5. Bhaṭṭadīpikā on Pūrvamīmāṃsā-darśana (Mysore), II p.317.

of the state over the soil were increasing in actual practice. It is quite likely that the Mīmāṃsā view has to be traced to the protest recorded in the Brāhmaṇa literature[1] on the part of the Earth against its donation.[2] But it cannot be denied that there was a definite opinion among a section of the thinkers who denied the king the claim of ownership of the soil. And then the reputation of the Mīmāṃsā view as authoritative on legal and juristic issues would suggest that this was by no means a feeble opinion. We find that Medhātithi[3] discusses and explains the Mīmāṃsā standpoint on the question and by implication accepts its authoritative character. Even the seventeenth century text Vyavahāramayūkha[4] quotes Jaimini with approval and follows the discussion of the proprietary rights of a conqueror as found in Khaṇḍadeva, the Mīmāṃsā commentator. The Mīmāṃsā view has been dismissed in a recent study as only a wishful theory.[5] It is to be noted that in almost all countries and ~~all~~ all times we find the queer phenomenon that , whatever the juristic opinion about the ownership of land, the state does with the land what its needs dictate, though at times in order to satisfy the demands of democracy it advances compensation

---

1. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, XIII.7.1.15; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, IV.8.21.
2. Cf. S.K.Maity, Economic life in the Gupta period, p.22.
3. On Manu, VIII.99.
4. p.91.
5. R.C.P.Singh, Kingship in Northern India. p.339. Cf. S.K. Maity, Op.cit.

determined by the State itself.

The legal texts of the period following earlier Smrtis discuss legal questions concerning boundary disputes, dispossession and the alienation of land, including its lease, mortgage, sale and gift, thus by implication granting the rights which generally make ownership. The relative importance of possession and legitimate title, the two constituents of ownership has been discussed at great length in the legal works.[1] Efforts were made by the commentaries and digests of our period[2] to reconcile the conflict in the opinion of the Smṛtis about the minimum period of adverse possession creating ownership. The impression which we gather from relevant references in the Agni Purāṇa[3] and the Kṛtyakalpataru[4] is that individuals possessed all the rights of granting or otherwise alienating their fields and could seek legal remedy against any encroachment or infringement of their right.

U.N.Ghoshal[5] has observed that Medhātithi makes two inconsistent statements about property, mentioning the king as the

---

1. Mitākṣarā on Yāj., II.27; Smṛticandrikā (ed. Gharpure), II pp.70ff; Vyavahāranirnaya, pp.132, 73; Sarasvatīvilāsa, p.124
2. Cf. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, II pp.322ff.
3. LXX.6; CLXXIII.44; CCXI.13-15, 33-37; CCLIII.23, 52-3; CCLVII.1ff.
4. Dāna, p.191 for land-grants; Vyavahāra, p.153 for sale deeds etc. of fields; Gārhasthya, p.182 explains bhūmisvāmine in Baudh., III.2.1-15 as bhūmirasyāstīti.
5. History of Indian Political Ideas, p.426.

lord (prabhu) of the soil on one place and elsewhere stating that the field belongs to him who made it fit for cultivation by clearing it. R.C.R$Singh[1] points out that Medhātithi's views on Manu VIII.39 and 99 appear to be contradictory; "one refers to the royal ownership while the other seems to maintain the communal ownership of land". He adds that if the communal ownership of land had been in Medhātithi's mind, he would surely have stated the fact more clearly and that we must look on his apparent support of communal ownership as pios theorising. He concludes that in practice Medhātithi admitted the king's ownership of the land. We however feel that Medhātithi ascribed to individual ownership of land. This is clear from numerous passages in which he grants to an individual all the rights of ownership over a field.[2] In some of these he makes a clear reference to kṣetra or field being the agricultural land (dhānyānāṃ bhavana-bhūmiḥ)[3]. The statement of Medhātithi on Manu VIII.39 is not his definite opinion on the legal question of the ownership of land. It is essentially of the nature of a general maxim which has been mentioned only as a second line of argument to justify the claims of the king to a share in the

---

1. Op. cit., pp.338-40.
2. On Manu, VIII.144, 148, 151, 165; IX.49, 55, 323.
3. Ibid., II.246; XI.162.

treasure-trove which actually the king receives on the grounds of the protection afforded by him. When Medhātithi speaks of the king as the master of the soil (prabhur-asau bhūmeḥ) and of the soil as belonging to him (tadīyāyāśca bhuvaḥ) he does not mean to lay down the legal status of the king as the owner of all cultivable land in the state but only points out the sovereignty of the king implying a general lordship of the king over all things in his kingdom. It is in his commentary on Manu VIII.99 that Medhātithi discusses the question of the ownership of land. Here he establishes individual ownership. R.C.P.Singh[1] interprets the commentary to indicate that Medhātithi refutes the induvidual ownership of land and establishes that land is common property. But the extracts on which Dr.Singh relies do not contain the opinion of Medhātithi. Medhātithi is here putting the case of the other side and then goes on to refute it and establish his own view. It appears that due to an oversight the subsequent portions of the commentary missed the attention of Dr.Singh. Discussing the statement of Manu that he who deposes falsely in regard to land kills all, Medhātithi poses the possible objection, based on the protest in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[2] against land-grants, that the earth is the

---

1. Op.cit., pp. 327-29.
2. XIII.7.1.15.

common property of all men and kings are appointed only for taking care of it, and hence there cannot be any giving away or taking away of the whole of this earth or any disputes regarding its possession. Medhātithi replies that just as the entire earth is spoken of as bhūmi (land), so also are fields, villages and platforms and over these latter, ownership is certainly possible; and the making over or taking away also of such ownership is directly perceptable; the taking away of this consists in asserting ownership in an improper manner and the mere dismantling of a house or the cutting of a tree or walking over another man's land or taking clay out of it do not constitute the act of taking away the land. Regarding the possible objection that the Mīmāṃsakas[1] declare land to be common to all, Medhātithi first quotes a verse of Kṛṣṇadvaipāyana (Vyāsa, the author of the Mahābhārata), referring to the gift of land, to indicate that the term land is found to be used in the sense also of parts of the earth, andi then explains the assertion of land being common to all as referring to the entire globe, to roam about over which all men are equally entitled, and which therefore cannot be owned by anyone. He adds that in accordance with the Mīmāṃsā injunction villages and towns can be given away at the Viśvajit sacrifice. He concludes by quoting the

---

1. Jaimini VI.3.3.

lines "they present as sacrificial fee, the bhūmi with the exception of the platform (sadaḥ) and the wife's room (patnī-śālaṃ)" and observing that , as this would not be applicable to the entire earth, the giving must refer to fields and such other parts of it only.

Stray references in the literary works of the period also suggest individual ownership. Thus the Deśopadeśa[1] mentions the land of a miser along with his cash property, house and wife as objects which he hoards but are enjoyed by others. A verse in the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa[2] which speaks of families (kulas) in a village oppressed by the feudal chief (bhoga-pati) as not willing to leave out of the consideration for the hereditary land (nija-vaṃśa-bhūr-iti) may be construed to indicate that agricultural lands were owned by families. The Mānasollāsa[3] speaks of the stealing of a field along with that of a house, garments, grain, cash, etc. Elsewhere[4] it mentions gladiators called bhūmyaṅka who fought for houses, fields etc. and who acted as champions to decide boundary disputes.

Some inscriptions of our period which record cases of land-grants and land-sales by private individuals corroborate the testimony of the legal works. Thus a Bhubaneswar inscription[5]

---

1. II.6.
2. v.1175.
3. I p.4 v.40.
4. II p.223 vv.833-34.
5. E.I., XXX.160-61.

records that a certain lady named Maḍamadevī purchased in conjunction with a leading merchant (sādhu-pradhāna) from the hands of a śresthin a piece of land in Devadhara-grāma and granted it in favour of the god Kīrttivāseśvara of Śiva worshipped in the Liṅgarāja Temple. We have some other inscriptions from the Liṅgarāja Temple which prove the case. In one inscription a certain Bhāvasadāśiva-guru donates a piece of land purchased with the savings from his begging.[1] Another inscription would seem to have recorded the grant of sixty-five units of land in two villages made probably by a certain person belonging to the kāyastha community.[2] Another kāyastha is found donating five vāṭikās and five mānas of land.[3] Another private grant is about 2½ vāṭikās of land.[4] The praśasti of Baijnath from Kangra[5] records three land-grants by private individuals, one a field requiring one vaha (=four dronas) of seed corn by an astrologer, another measuring half a plough by a certain brāhmaṇa and the third by a merchant. In an inscription from Sanderav (Jodhpur)[6] many cart-builders (rathakāras) residing

---

1. I.C., III.126.
2. Ibid., 124-25.
3. I.H.Q., XXXI.82-83.
4. I.C., VI.76. In another record the gift most probably made by two brāhmaṇas has been described as being of ten pāṭikas- I.C., VI.73. It is possible that the intended reading was vāṭikās.
5. E.I., I.104-7 vv.32-34.
6. E.I., XI p.47.

at Sanderaka are said to have donated a plough (hāela) measure of land suitable for the cultivation of yugaṃdharī (millet) corn. An inscription from Dabok[1] records the grant of five fields and two shops, the fields being described as having been acquired by the donor himself, a certain physician, and at that time in the share of one of his sons.

In some inscriptions lands owned by private individuals are mentioned in connection with the demarcation of the boundaries of the donated land.[2] Fields which were owned by cultivators themselves are generally described as kuṭumba-kṣetras.[3] Often the term satka is mentioned to convey the idea of ownership.[4] In this connection the testimony of some 7thm century inscriptions of the Maitrakas is significant.[5] Besides the brahmadeya lands we have two distinct types of fields in these records. Some are described as being owned by a certain individual (satka) while others are mentioned as tilled by a certain individual (prakṛṣṭa or kṛṣṭa). It is clear that the basis of this difference in terminology was the claim to the ownership of land.

---

1. E.I., XX.123-25.
2. E.I., XX.123-25; XXI.172; XXXIII.236-7.
3. C.I.I., IV no.22 11.20, 24; E.I., XXII.115-20; XXI.183f; IV.76-81.
4. E.I., XXXIII.236f; XXI.172, 183f, 210f; IV.76-81; XXII.115-20; Gadre, Inscriptions from Baroda, I pp.16-24.
5. E.I., XXII.115-20; XXI.183f; IV.76-81.

This difference is to be noticed in the Ashrafpur plate of Devakhaḍga[1] which mentions a pāṭaka of land as enjoyed by Sarvāntara but cultivated by Śikhara and others.

We have elsewhere[2] shown that the grant of a village did not amount to an assignment of the proprietary rights over the arable land in the village. This is supported by inscriptions which mention the grant of a village together with a particular tract in it.[3] It seems that what was granted in the case of the village was the right to revenue, whereas in the case of a particular field it was the proprietary right over it. The king had the proprietary right only over certain fields and he could donate the ownership only of these cultivable lands. In the Dabok inscription[4] we see that in connection with the specification of the boundaries of the donated lands only some of the fields are described as king's fields (rājakīyakṣetram). It has to be noted that in the Jesar plates of Śīlāditya III,[5] slightly earlier than the period of our study, the grant consists of a reservoir of water (vāpī) extending over 25 pādāvarttas of

---

1. M.A.S.B., I.88, 90.
2. J.E.S.H.O., IV.251ff.
3. E.I., XIV.184-87 (Part II ll.14-27).
4. E.I., XX.123-25.
5. E.I., XXII.115-20. In the Urlam (Ganjam) Plates of Hastivarman (E.I., XVII.332-33) the king is said to have purchased 2½ ploughs of land from the owner of an agrahāra land (agrahārika) in order to make a donation.

land from the royal domain land (rājakīya), two pieces of land which belonged to extinct families of cultivators (utsanna-kuṭumbika) and which must have reverted to the king, and three pieces of land said to have been cultivated (prakṛṣṭa and not owned, satka) by a certain Kikaka. It is clear that the king could donate only those pieces of cultivable land which were in his direct ownership and not all the pieces owned by individuals. The necessity for the king to donate several pieces of land scattered over a large area and situated at a distance from one another[1] arose from this limitation to the proprietary rights of a king in the villages. This explanation has been controverted by R.C.P.Singh[2] on the ground that the donation of consolidated land would have meant dispossessing the earlier recipients of some of the religious grants. We fear the objection is not valid since in some at least of the inscriptions recording the donation of land in fragments the enumeration of boundaries does not mention brahmadeya lands alone but also some fields owned by private individuals and cultivators.[3]

We get references to some thinkers advocating State ownership of land. Thus Bhaṭṭasvāmin, while commenting on a passage

---

1. E.I., XXII.115-20; XXI.183-4, 210-11; XI.81-4; IV.76-81.
2. Op.cit., pp. 316-7.
3. E.I., XXII.115-20; XXI.183-4; IV.76-81.

in the Arthaśāstra[1], quotes a verse meaning that those who are well-versed in the sacred books declare the king to be the lord of land as well as water; the householders have the right of ownership over all other things except these two. The Mānasollāsa[2] also appears to hold a similar view. It is to be noted that Mitramiśra[3] of a later date discusses the two verses of Kātyāyana[4], often quoted to support the king's ownership of land[5], in a way which removes the ambiguity of the original passage. These verses of Kātyāyana were also quoted by Lakṣmīdhara, the Gāhaḍavāla minister, in his digest, the Kṛtyakalpataru[6]. We have elsewhere[7] shown that in ancient times the king was said to have a general claim over everything in the state. In our period itx appears that sometimes the peasant was viewed as having only a qualified ownership of the soil, the king being endowed with a superior claim to it. Thus the Rājataraṅgiṇī[8] speaks of king

---

1. II.24; J.B.O.R.S., XII p.138.
2. I p.61 v.361.
3. Vīramitrodaya, Rājanīti (Banaras), p.271 - Rājā bhuvah svāmī smṛtah. Anyadravyasya bhūsambamdhidravyasya na svāmī. Anyathā bhūmisvāmyābhāve. Bhūtānām prāṇinām. Tannivāsitvāt bhūnivāsitvāt. Svāmitam rājña iti śeṣah. Ityatah tatkriyābaliṣadbhāga prāpnuyāt.
4. 16-17.
5. U.N.Ghoshal, Indian Historiography and other essays, p.164.
6. Rājadharma, p.90.
7. J.E.S.H.O., IV.257f.
8. III.101 - Īśo nrpānām nihśeṣa-kṣmā-kedāra-kutumbinām.

Śreṣṭhasena as the lord of those kings who are cultivators of the fields, that is the whole earth. Here king Śreṣṭhasena is said to have occupied the same position vis a vis the lesser kings, as does a king with the cultivators. The implication it seems to be taht the cultivators are the owners of their fields but the king has a superior title.[1]

In any case it is clear from the land-grants of the period that the king had many claims over the village land and he transferred these to the donees. These privileges would indicate that he claimed a theoretical ownership to the soil. Thus in the Pāla records[2] a village is said to be granted up to its boundaries, grass and pasture land (sva-sīmā-tṛṇa-yūti-gocara-paryanta), with its ground (sa-tala), with the space above the ground (soddeśa), with its mango and mahuā trees (sāmra-madhūka), with its water and dry land (sa-jala-sthala) and with its pits and saline spots (sa-garttoṣara). The grants of the Senas and the feudatory families[3] which arose in Bengal add to these the rights to the trees of panāsa, gūvāka and cocoanut (nālikera) and to salt (sa-lavaṇa). In a plate from Kelga (Sonepur)[4] the

---

1. Cf. R.C.P.Singh, Op. cit., pp.348f where the passage is quoted to establish that the king was the owner of the whole world.
2. E.g. E.I. XV.295-8. Cf. ibid., XXIX p.5 f.n.3.
3. E.g. E.I. XXXIII.138-40; XXX.262-3.
4. E.I., XXVIII.327-8.

village is said to have been granted along with ivory, tiger's skin and various wild animals (hastidanta-vyāghracarma-nānāvana-cara-sameta), with its water and dry land, with fish and tortoises (sa-matsya-kacchapa), with residences and plants (sa-kheṭa-viṭapa), with trenches and mounds (sa-khallonnata), with village-habitations and forests (sa-padrāraṇyaka), with shrubs and creepers (sa-gulma-latāka), with mangoes, mahuā, tamarind, palmyra and various trees. The Irda grant of the Kamboja king Nayapāladeva[1] records that the village was donated together with homesteads and arable land, water-courses, pits and paths (vāstu-kṣetra-jalādhāra-gartta-mārgga-samanvita), with saline soil, land where sweepings are thrown and salt-mines (soṣarāvaskara-sthāna-nivīta[2]-lavaṇākara), adorned with groups of trees like mango and mahuā and along with the markets, bathing places and ferries (sa-haṭṭa-ghaṭṭa-sa-tara). In the records of the Kalacuris[3] the villages are granted together with pasture land for cows (sa-gopracāra), with its water and dry land, with mango and mahuā trees, with salt mines (sa-lavaṇākara), with its pits and saline spots, with the egress and ingress to it (sa-nirgama-praveśa), with fertile and marshy lands (sa-jāṅgalānūpa), with

---

1. E.I., XXII.154-7 vv.18-21.
2. Nivīta in this context is difficult to explain. Derived from ni + √vye as an adjective it means "hung or adorned with". As a noun it means a veil, mantle or wrepper. See Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v., nivye.
3. C.I.I., IV.324-31; ibid., 645-52.

tree-groves, plant-gardens, grass and so forth (vṛkṣārāmodbhid-odyānatṛṇādisahita) and with rivers and hills (sa-nadīparvata). In the Candella records we met two enumerations of these privileges. Usually the village is granted along with its water and dry land, inanimate and animate objects (sa-sthāvara-jaṅgama), fenced by its own boundaries (sva-sīmāvacchinna), with what is under and above its soil (sādha-ūrddha), with its salt mines, stones, forests and trees and what is outside and inside (sa-bāhyābhyantara) and other things also (apara vastu).[1] The more detailed list of privileges mentions the grant of the village along with houses and fences (sa-mandira-prākāra), with the egress and ingress to it, with all articles of food (sarvvāśana), sugarcane, safflower, cotton, sana (hemp), mango, mahuā and other trees, with forests, pits and hoards (sa-vana-khani-nidhāna) with the mines of iron and salt, and the place of the origin of leaves and others (sa-loha-lavaṇa-tṛṇa-parṇṇādyākara), with its ground (talā), reservoirs, rivers and hills, with its pits, squares (catvara), and saline soil, its wood (kāṣṭha), bricks and stones, its cowherds (sa-gokula), its animals, beasts, birds and aquatic animals and all other things within its boundaries.[3]

---

1. E.I., XX.135-6.
2. According to Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary Āśana is Terminalia Tomentosa.
3. E.I., XXXII.121-3. Often the two lists are mentioned together - E.I., XX.129-31.

In the Paramāra records[1] the villages are granted along with the rows of trees (sa-vṛkṣamālākula), with houses, house-sites (gṛha-sthāna), granaries (khala), threshing-floor (khala-sthāna), pits (tala-bhedyā ?), cow-sheds (go-vāṭikā), temples, gardens, tanks, step-wells (vāpī), wells, etc. In the grants of the Pratihāras[2] and the Gāhaḍavālas[3] also we find that the privileges transferred to the donees were similar in nature. Scholars do not agree on the extent to which these rights were actually exercised by the king.[4] What, in any case, is obvious is the fact that the king was making a public claim of these rights, which may be interpreted as a general indication of the increasing claim of the king over the land.

In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[5] king Jayāpīḍa is said to have gone, in his persistent greed, so far in cruelty that for three years he took the whole harvest, including the cultivator's share. This was no doubt an unusual action, rightly censured by Kalhaṇa, but we have to note the suggestion that sometimes kings viewed themselves as owners of the entire arable land in the state and

---

1. E.I., XXXII.148-56.
2. E.I., XVIII.322-4; XXX.148-50.
3. E.I., XXXIII.178-80.
4. A.S.Altekar, State and Government, p.211; C.V.Vaidya, History of Mediaeval Hindu India, II.460-61; A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.248.
5. IV.628.

hence as entitled to the whole or a major portion of the crop. In two inscriptions[1] of the reign of the Caulukya king Bhīmadeva I we find that the fields donated are described as being owned (sathn) by private individuals. There can be many possible explanations of the owners losing their rights over the plots.[2] As rightly pointed out by the learned editor of one of these inscriptions[3], the grants being made on religious occasions, the king, anxious to do a work of piety, might well have commandeered the fields in return for compensation. But it looks rather strange that, unlike other similar cases[4], the two grants are totally silent about the way in which the owners came to lose their rights, whether by escheat or by sale. If the individuals said to have been owners of the fields were occupying the fields at the time of the grant, this may indicate that sometimes in practice also the ownership of the individuals was viewed as a qualified one when compared with the over-riding rights of the king.

In our period we witness the emergence of the feudal chief as a third claimant to the ownership of soil. The feudatories and feudal chiefs had a restricted title. The Mitākṣarā[5] obser-

---

1. E.I., XXXIII.236-7; XXI.172.
2. Cf. E.I., XXXIII.235.
3. Ibid.
4. E.g., Jesar Plates of Śīlāditya III - E.I., XXII.115-20 and the Ūrlam Plates of Hastivarman - E.I., XVII.332-3.
5. On Yāj., I.318-Anena bhūpatereva bhūmidāne nibandhadāne vādhikāro na bhogapateriti darśitam.

ves that the privilege of making a gift of land belonged only to the king and not to the fief-holder. We have some references to indicate that the suzerain ruler had the right to grant land which was directly held by his vassals. Thus a feudatory ruler Gaṅgadeva made a land-grant as desired by his suzerain king Jayavarman of the Paramāra dynasty.[1] Likewise Naravarman, another Paramāra emperor, donated lands in a village under his feudatory Rājyadeva.[2] Though theoretically the feudatory rulers were not entitled to make land-grants, we find that in reality they did donate lands. We can classify such charters into many kinds according to the degree of dependence or independence of the feudatory rulers.[3] In some cases the grant is said to have been made at a request of a certain feudatory. When the feudatory was of no great importance the record would not make even this reference, but would simply introduce the name of the feudatory.[4] In the Gāhaḍavāla empire we find the land-grant of a rāṇaka being announced by the heir apparent (mahārājaputra) Govindacandra on behalf of the emperor.[5] Sometimes the imperial permission was granted through an officer. Thus we see that ~~in~~ the land-grant of the feudatory ruler Avantivarman II was approved

---

1. E.I., IX.120ff.
2. E.I., XX no. 11. Cf. E.I., I.89 for an instance from Gujarat.
3. E.I., XXXIII p.50.
4. Ibid., pp.51-53.
5. I.A., XVIII pp.14-19. Cf. E.I., XX no.11 for Paramāra king Naravarman notifying two land-grants made by a provincial governor and his wife.

by Dhiika, the tantrapāla (most likely an officer like the resident political agent) of Mahendrapāla, the Pratihāra emperor.[1] In the Partabgarh inscription we find that the Cāhamāna Mahā-sāmanta Indrarāja had to request Mādhava, the provincial governor at Ujjain, for the grant of a village.[2] If however the feudatory had sufficient power and importance he issued his land charters without reference to his overlord's permission.[3] With a further growth in power the feudatory ruler must have asserted his claim to the soil and insisted on putting his sign-manual on grants concerning his territory though made by the overlord himself. There is one instance where the feudatory got another set of plates issued with his name also on it, as the original plates issued by his overlord did not contain his sign.[4]

The feudal elements must have gained in importance in the period, with the growing tendency to remunerate the officers in the form of assignments of land. It would appear from the combined testimony of Hsüan Tsang[5] and Bāṇa[6] that in the time of Harṣa the state officers were paid mostly in the form of land-

---

1. E.I., IX pp.6ff.
2. E.I., XIV.184-7 (Part II, ll.14-27). Cf. E.I., XXXII.139ff.
3. Proceedings of All India Oriental Conference, I.325f; I.A., XVIII.84f; E.I., XXVIII.201, 266, 332; XXX.139.
4. J.B.B.R.A.S., XXVI.258.
5. Watters, I p.176.
6. Harṣacarita (ed. J.Vidyasagara), p.93.

grants. But it is only from the ninth century that we get epigraphic references to land-grants made to officers, and these increase in number from the eleventh century.[1] The rights of these officers however appear to have been of a restricted nature. Thus in an inscription of the Cāhamānas of Sambhar we have a reference to the religious grant of a village of his fief made by a duḥsādya but with the permission of his master.[2] According to a copper plate dated 1260 A.D.[3] king Jayavarman II caused a certain pratihāra (head of the palace-guard) to donate a village to three brāhmaṇas. This officer would appear to have been enjoying the village as his assignment because it is he who is said to have performed the religious ceremonies connected with the grant, but he had to do it with the permission of his master who signed it and made it a royal charter. The Bargaon plate[4] records the grant of a village by king Vajrahasta III but an endorsement at the end makes it clear that the grant

---

1. J.E.S.H.O., IV.99f. We have to notice three types of assignments to state officers. Cases where officers are said to have received villages from the king would not, strictly speaking, come under the category of assignments in lieu of their salaries. As has been made clear in some of these cases the villages were granted by the king who was pleased with the officer for some valuable services. Cf. I.A., XXI.170-71. There are also references to state officers possessing and granting villages which were most likely by way of their remuneration. We have indications to suggest that sometimes the officers were assigned a share in the revenue from the village.
2. E.I., II no.8.
3. E.I., IX no.13 (B).
4. E.I., XXIX pp.48ff.

was actually made by an officer of the king out of his own fief. It would appear that the grant of the officer had to be issued in the name of the king. Another similar case would appear to have been preserved in the Mehar plate[1], which records a grant of land by king Dāmodara but introduces Gaṅgādharadeva, the officer in charge of the royal elephant force, who is introduced after the reference to the king. An inscription of Mahendrapāla II[2] which records the grant of a village by the emperor in the possession of talavarggika Hariṣaḍa indicates that the officer had been given the village but had only a limited right in the sense that the king could give it to another. A more abiding claim of these officers is suggested by the inscription in which king Vākpatirāja is said to have re-granted to a goddess a village when requested to do so by the wife of the mahāsādhanika Mahāika[3] who obviously had received it as an assignment. A regent of five districts under king Vajrahasta of the Ganga dynasty is found giving a village to the bridegroom on the occasion of the marriage of his daughter.[4] In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[5] Suyya, the engineer, is said to have granted to a village to the

---

1. E.I., XXVII.182ff.
2. E.I., XIV.182-84 (Part I, ll.1-14).
3. I.A., XIV.160.
4. E.I., III no.31.
5. V.120.

brāhmaṇas. King Avantivarman is said to have divided his kingdom among his relatives and officers, most likely in the form of estates and fiefs.[1] A story in the Bṛhatkathākośa[2] would indicate that the service tenure villages were not necessarily always permanent grants. We read that a sahasrabhaṭa warrior had been granted a number of villages as his tenure but after his death his fief was not inherited by his son but by another manwho was skilled in the use of javelin and spear and was appointed as sahasrabhaṭa warrior. The Udayasundarīkathā[3] refers to a kāyastha officer enjoying a tenure which was permanent and hereditary. Significantly enough Lakṣmīdhara explains deśapati as "soldiers etc"[4], suggesting thereby that the usual mode of remunerating warriors was through land assignments which carried with them some abiding claims of ownership. Thus service and rulership would appear to have been often associated together in the early medieval period. Such close political and administrative control over a limited area would often tend to help the emergence of rights of ownership.

Even more significant than this was the emergence of a class

---

1. Ibid., V.121.
2. p.59.
3. p.152 - Pūrvapuruṣakramāgatāyā dhruvavṛtteḥ prabhuḥ.
4. Kṛtyakalpataru, Brahmacāri, p.251 - deśapatiḥ sainikādiḥ.

of landed aristocracy as an intermediary enjoying the revenues of one or more villages. We have already referred to the practice of villages being granted to vassals and officials as a mark of the favour of the king. Religious grants to individuals and institutions alike must have gone a ~~long way to create a~~ long way to create a class of landlords. It would appear that there was also a system resembling samindari. We find that individuals sometimes acquired the status of village lords, and that this right could be transferred and bought and sold like any other commodity. In the Madras Museum Plates of the time of king Narendradhavala[1] we find that a certain Seḍā purchased a village as a kraya-śāsana (land sold by a deed of purchase) and some years later re-sold it as a kraya-śāsana to three persons. An inscription from Kaman (Bharatpur) refers to a village owned by a certain man named Untaṭa.[2] In an inscription from Hazaribagh roughly assigned to the seventh or eighth century we find that with the consent of the king three brothers were accepted by the people of three villages as their rulers.[3] It can very well be imagined that these local chiefs and village lords would have converted their power of administration and

---

1. E.I., XXVIII.49-50.
2. E.I., XXIV.336 ll.19-21.
3. E.I., II p.343.

right to revenue into claims of rulership and ownership. The weakening of the central authority in general must have favoured such a development.

We have certain references which indicate that the feudal chief claimed some form of ownership over the land. Hemacandra[1] speaks of the feudal assignment which had to be protected against encroachment by neighbouring chiefs as the ancestral property or land. The growth in the claims of the feudal chief naturally weakened those of the cultivators. It is not without significance that in a village owned by a certain individual a brāhmaṇa is mentioned as cultivating a field measuring three plough, but soon it was given to a ploughman (hālika) and then before long it was donated as a religious gift.[2] In the Rajor inscription the feudatory chief Mathanadeva grants a village and in enumerating the rights and privileges transferred to the donee describes it as accompanied with all the neighbouring fields cultivated by the Gurjjaras.[3] There is a suggestion in a verse in the Śārṅgadharapaddhati[4] that generally the cultivators did not own the land and the acquisition of the proprietary right

---

1. Prākrit Vyākaraṇa, IV.395, v.6 -
   Puttem jāem kavaṇu guṇu avaguṇu kavaṇu muṇa.
   Jā bappī kī bhuṃhaḍī campijjaï avareṇa.
2. E.I., XXIV.336 ll.10-21.
3. E.I., III.266-67.
4. v.2508-Niyoginaḥ kṣatriyasya durgā cenmastake viśet.
   Padapratiṣṭhāvaśyaṃ syādbhūmilābhaḥ kutumbinaḥ.

to their fields was a distinct rise in their status. It is not unlikely that the growing restrictions on the claims of the peasant to his field, as implied in the emergence of feudal chiefs and village lords, was at the back of the explanations given in the legal texts of the period that ownership does not comprise only what one can dispose of at one's will but what is capable in appropriate circumstances ~~only~~ of being disposed of as one likes.[1] We have already pointed out that these texts attach importance to the discussion about ownership as being a separate category or capacity.[2]

x x x x x x x

There is no indication that in earlier times cultivators were tied to the soil like the European serfs. They enjoyed the freedom to migrate to another state if they were oppressed.[3] The same right is implied in the texts of our period. Thus the Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa[4] says that, being much afflicted by the sufferings caused by famine and taxation, people feel distressed and migrate to countries rich in wheat and barley. A verse in

---

1. Madanaratna q. by Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.555. Cf. Jīmūtavāhana, Nīlakaṇṭha and Mitramiśra q. by U.N.Ghoshal, Agrarian System in Ancient India, pp.85f. Also Vyavasthā-candrikā (ed. S.C.Sirkar) I (i) cl.51 and Smṛticandrikā, I cl.25.
2. See supra p.31.
3. Mbh., XII.89.24.
4. XXXVIII.87.

the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa[1] speaks of men in a village leaving it when oppressed by the feudal chief. In ~~the~~ the entire range of Sanskrit literature the only reference suggesting some form of manorial right which we have been able to trace is in the Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[2] of our period. In a city described as the fief (bhukti) of a certain king Karmma-pariṇāma the entire population is said to have been thrown into cells and kept huddled together for all times (apavarakeṣu nikṣipya sampiṇḍitāḥ sakala-kālaṃ dhāryante). Another king named Sadāgama often used to liberate some of these people and settle them in another city which could not be approached by Karmma-pariṇāma (asmadīyabhukter-niḥsārayanti kāṃścillokam sthāpayati cāsmākam agamyāyāṃ nirvṛtau nagaryām). In this way the population under king Karmma-pariṇāma would have thinned down but his sister brings people from another city to fill up the places vacated by people whom Sadāgama has liberated.

In our period, however, we find signs of serfdom and of

---

1. v.1175. The position seems to have hardly changed even in the time of Babur who observes that "in Hindustan hamlets and villages, towns indeed, are depopulated and set up in a moment! If the people of a large town , one ~~kkk~~ inhabited for years even, flee from it, they do it in such a way that not a sign or trace of them remains in a day or a day and a half" - The Bābur-nāma tr. A.S.Beveridge, II p.488.
2. pp.176-78.

manorial villages in some parts of northern India.[1] A stray plate from Nanana (Marwar), belonging to the twelfth century,[2] records certain persons being granted or permanently allotted to the god Tripuruṣa. It is clear from the plate that these people were not slaves but independent persons including cultivators, songstresses and musicians. Section I records that a flute player (vāṁśika) named Lhauḍiyāka was allotted to the deity. In section II/ we read of two persons named Śīlapati and Śrīpāla, who were probably engaged in working the araghaṭṭa at Devanandita-grāma, being allotted to the same god along with several other persons who probably lived in the locality where the temple stood. These were six songstresses, a suravāla (a person responsible for setting songs or musical instruments to tune), a paṇavika (drum-player), a doyaraka (a singer who had to repeat parts of a song after they had been once sung), a mārdaṅgika (mṛdaṅga-player) and a flute-player. All these are named individually. Section VI records that Mahārājādhirāja Ratnapāla gave away a certain Noriyaka together with his family. In section VII Mahārājaputra kumāra Sahaṇapāla is said to have granted to the temple two agriculturist householders (kuṭumbikas) for-

---

1. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S. does not take any notice of this question. B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History is also silent about it.
2. E.I., XXXIII.244ff.

merly living at the village Naṃdāṇā together with their sons and grandsons so long as they lived. Section VIII records that Mahārāja Ālhaṇadeva granted two agriculturist householders (kuṭuṃ = kuṭumbikas) who were formerly living in the village of Naṃdāṇā and also more than two brothers whose names cannot be made out.

From a number of inscriptions from Orissa we learn that the king claimed some sort of ownership over men of certain occupations and crafts and often used to transfer his right over them to the donee.[1] In these records the stock list of the rights accompanying the grant includes that over weavers (tantuvāya), milkmen (gokūṭa), distillers (śauṇḍika) and other subjects (prakṛtika).[2] That it was not a theoretical claim but had practical application would follow from set II of the Kendupatna plates of Narasiṃha II.[3] This records that king Narasiṃha donated to Bhīmadevaśarman several plots measuring 100 vāṭikāa of land and as a part of this donation (etacchāsanasyāṅgatayā) granted as servants and subjects permanently attached (parajāḥ) seven men named in the record - a maker of conch-shell bangles

---

1. Terundia Plates of Śubhakara II - E.I., XXVIII.215f; Adilpur Plates of Narendrabhañjadeva - E.I., XXV.159ff and the Plates of Daṇḍīmahādevī - E.I., VI.137-40, 141f; XXIX.87ff.
2. Prakṛti at times is found used in the narrow sense of men belonging to crafts and occupations formed into guilds. See infra p. 142.
3. E.I., XXVIII.190-91.

(śaṅkhakāra), a merchant (śreṣṭhin), a goldsmith (suvarṇṇakāra), an oilman (tailika), a milkman (gopāla), a potter (kumbhakāra) and another oilman (teli). In the Kharepatan (Ratnagiri) plates[1] Raṭṭarāja records that he assigned to his teacher families of female attendants (dārikā-kuṭumbāni), a family of oilmen, a family of gardeners, a family of potters and a family of washermen.

The Bhatera (Sylhet) inscription[2] states that Govinda-Keśavadeva donated to the god Śiva 375 halas of land with 296 houses in various villages and also gave many attendant subjects who belonged to ordinary social groups and lived on the donated land (nānā-parijanāṃstasmin janajātīnaneśkaśaḥ). That the grant really carried with it a legal claim over the people inhabiting the houses and lands donated would be clear from the fact that the inscription devotes considerable space (lines 29 to 51) enumerating the different plots of land and houses in different villages. The inscription mentions the individual occupants of the houses by name; in some cases they are said to have been craftsmen, including cowherds, a bell-metal worker, a barber, a washerman, a boatman and an ivory-worker.

---

1. E.I., III.297-302.
2. E.I., XIX.279-86. In the Tezpur grant (J.A.S.B., IX, 1840, pp. 766ff, v.24) king Vanamāla is said to have made to the temple of Hāṭakeśvara Śiva a gift consisting of villages, men, prostitutes and elephants.

In the above-mentioned inscriptions the people who are attached to a deity as a religious grant are either agriculturist householders or men belonging to occupations which had a low social status. The term parajā or parijana employed for them is used in modern times in a sense which has to be distinguished from servants and slaves alike and stands for men of certain occupations who are in a way permanently associated with the chief of the village as his attendants. As against these there are a few inscriptions in some parts of northern India which indicate that kings claimed some sort of an ownership over the inhabitants of villages in their jurisdiction. Thus in Assam we find that Vallabhadeva granted seven villages to an alms-house[1] and the list of rights accompanying the grant includes that over the people living in them (sa-janan). In some of the inscriptions from Bengal the land is granted along with the people (sa-prajā).[2] A Plate in the India Office, on palaeographic considerations assigned to the eleventh or twelfth century, records that a certain king Vijayarājadeva granted to some people the cultivated lands, wells, houses and kuṭumbikas in the estate

---

1. E.I., V.181ff.
2. E.I., XXVIII.56-58.
3. E.I., III.313f.
4. There is nothing to connect him with any of the known dynasties of the period. It is even difficult to be certain about the region in which he ruled.

(paribhoga) of Kesarikoṭṭa which were not enjoyed by Mūladeva[1] and a village along with its bipeds (dvipada), quadrupeds (catuṣpada), fields and the kuṭumbikas[2]. The Candella grants are more clear in this respect. The donated villages are described as carrying with them the right over the artisans, cultivators and merchants living in them[3].

As regards the status of the men said to have been attached to the donee as a religious grant it is clear that they were not slaves but independent persons. They have to be distinguished alike from serfs, if serfdom is conceived as a perpetual adherence to the soil of an estate owned by a lord. If performance of services for other persons is taken as the essence of the status of a serf[4], the men of our inscriptions may be described as serfs but only in a restricted sense. The comparison is probably closer with the villeins of the European manorial system which is associated with dependence of a population on

---

1. Most likely the name of a certain deity in a temple who possessed a major portion of the land in Kesarikoṭṭa or else a feudatory chief.
2. The editor of the plate translates kuṭumbika as a house-slave but we prefer the more usual explanation as an agriculturist householder.
3. E.I., XXXII.121-23 ll.29-34 - sa-kāru-karsaka-vanig-vāstavyam. The Charkhari Plate of Paramardin (E.I., XX p.131 l.19) has sa-kārukapaṅkavaṅgi-vāstavyam. The mistakes in the expression were not realised earlier and hence scholars had difficulty in explaining it - J.U.P.H.S., XXIII.240 f.n.33.
4. Encyclopedia Britanica, s.v., serf.

a ruler consisting not in ownership extending over persons nor in contractual arrangements, but in various forms and degrees of subjection, chiefly regulated by custom.[1] We find it difficult to determine the precise status of the men of our grants. The records are totally silent about their obligations and the claims of the ruler. In one respect however their position seems to have been worse than the legal status of a villein or even a serf. Even if unfree a villein was not exposed to the arbitrary will of his lord; he was not a slave and was not brought and sold apart from his holding. The serf was also not given over to his lord to be owned as a thing or an animal. The records which speak of the men being granted or attached to the

---

1. Encyclopedia Britanica, s.v., manor. In medieval England we find that the two standard tests to determine the status of a villein were - uncertainty of services and the payments of merchet, though in practice the proof of villeinage was a very intricate matter, and one on which there was often much room for doubt - A.Lane Poole, Obligations of Society in the XII and XIII centuries, p.14. But we have no means to find out if any such tests were applied in India. The essence of villeinage was labour service; the villein must work for his lord for so many days in the week in addition to boon works, special tasks, precaria, at certain seasons of the year - A.Lane Poole, loc. cit., p.15. We may say that the epigraphic references in early medieval period also imply such obligations.

dence as living on the land granted contemplate a position similar to that of the manorial system. But in some of the donations of the stray plate from Nanana and set II of the Kendupatna plates of Narasiṃha II the men so attached are described as belonging to villages other than that granted. This would mean that in these cases the rulers transferred their rights over the subjects and attendants even without actually disposing of the land on which they dwelt, and in doing so could compel a man to move from one village to another.[1]

In medieval English society we find that there was a large and growing class of tenants who did not render any services, or did only insignificant services.[2] As we shall see subsequently[3] the Rājataraṅgiṇī and some of the inscriptions of our period show that the obligation to do forced labour was not always performed but was sometimes commuted by some payment in cash or kind.

In England we find that many a villein gained his liberty by escaping to a town where, if he remained unclaimed for a year

---

1. Even in England many aspects of medieval serfdom were very like slavery. In theory, at least, a lord could do what he pleased with his villein except kill or mutilate him and there are occasional records which show that a lord could sell his villein to another - A.Lane Poole, Op.cit., p.14.
2. Ibid., p.24.
3. See infra pp. 120-21.
4. ~~A.Lane Poole, Op. cit., pp.28-34.~~

and a day, he became free. A villein obtained his freedom also by entering the orders of the church. But the surest methods of obtaining manumission were by charter or by purchase, the money for which was provided by a third party, as the villein's property was in theory his lord's. Sometimes freedom was granted in return for services rendered, for example going on crusade in place of his lord. The enfranchisement of a serf was not only a definite act; it was also a solemn and a public act. The investiture with the arms of a freeman, the spear and lance was part of the formal ceremony of manumission.[1] We have no records to determine if there were in early medieval India also set rules for the manumission of villeins or any formal ceremonies connected with it. We can therefore only conjecture the possibilities. It is obvious that a run away villein if not recovered was in practice free. Likewise a master, if pleased with his villein, often might have freed him from his obligations. As we know that slaves in India could be emancipated if their purchase money was paid[2], we can postulate a similar rule in the case of villeins. We have some references to suggest that in India certain formalities were observed in connection with the manumission of a slave.[3] Similar formal ceremonies were probably

---

1. A.Lane Poole, Op. cit., pp.28-34.
2. Artha, III.13; Nārada, V.29-38.
3. Nāyādhammakahā, I p.21; Vyavahāra Bhāṣya, 6.208.

performed at the time when a villein obtained his freedom.

It is however to be remembered that this type of tenure was not found alike in all parts of northern India. On the contrary it seems to have prevailed only in certain scattered areas, chiefly in Rajasthan, Orissa and Assam, usually the peasants and other men in the villages being free and masters of their own persons. Such a quasi-manorial system must have evolved as a response to the narrowing horizon of economic wants and political requirements. The decline in the volume of trade activity and the political insecurity resulted in giving an agricultural basis to the social and political life. The weakening of the central authority naturally resulted in the increase in the power of local chiefs and lords. The strengthened political power of local chiefs in certain areas was bound in the course of time to lead to the establishment of such manorial rights.

There were certain tendencies in earlier times which helped the emergence of a tenure resembling the manorial system. Even in the early legal texts we find that the king is given the power to exact forced or unpaid labour from artisans and labourers.[1] An early epigraphic testimony to the existence of viṣṭi

---

1. Gautama, X.31-32; Manu VII.138; Viṣṇu III.32; Agnipurāṇa, CCXXIII.33; Śaṅkhalikhita q. in Vivādaratnākara, p.662.

is to be seen in the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman.[1] In the Arthaśāstra[2] forced labour seems to have been a regular thing, which the state utilised to its best advantage, recording the labour rendered by each citizen. We get an idea of the nature of the work included under viṣṭi from the Kāmasūtra[3] which speaks of peasant women as being compelled to perform for the village headman unpaid work of various kinds, such as filling up his granaries, taking things into or out of his house, clearing or decorating his residence, working in his fields, and spinning yarn of cotton, wool, flax or hemp for his clothes. The obligation of the peasant to cultivate the state land in the form of viṣṭi is referred to in the commentary on the Mahābhārata.[4]

The subjection of the people to the village chief may be traced back to the rights of the donee and the obligations of the residents in the village granted as they appear even in the earlier land-grants. In these records the villagers are required, besides paying their dues in cash and kind, to listen to the orders of the donee and to carry them out,[5] to perform

---

1. Select Inscriptions, p.372.
2. II.35.
3. V.5.5.
4. XII.140.21 - Yah kīnāśah śatam nivartanāni bhūmeh karṣati tena viṣṭirūpena rājakīyam api nivartana-daśakam karṣaṇīyam avīyavad rakṣaṇīyam ca.
5. E.I., II no.30; IX.nos.21, 39; XXIII nos. 3, 9; C.I.I., III nos. 25, 26, 40.

personal services to him[1] and to convey his messages.[2]

Another earlier tendency which favoured the emergence of manorial tenure was the practice to let out land to cultivators who received half the produce. Some early records would suggest that such men tilling land for half the crops were sometimes closely associated with the land granted and the grant was accompanied with a provision for these cultivators also. Thus the plates of the Śālaṅkāyana Vijaya Devavarman[3], which record a grant of twenty nivartanas of land, mention along with it that a house-site was granted to cultivators who worked for half the crops (addhiyamanussāṇaṃ). Likewise the Hirahadagalli plates of the Pallava king Śivaskandavarman[4] also provide for such cultivators called here addhikā.

It would appear that even by the fifth century there had come to emerge some form of manorial tenure in connection with the estates of religious establishments. Fa-hsien[5] says that after the Nirvāṇa of the Buddha, the kings, elders and lay Buddhists built monasteries for the monks and provided them with houses, gardens and fields, with husbandmen and cattle to culti-

---

1. E.I., XXVIII no.2.
2. E.I., XII no.17.
3. E.I., IX no.7.
4. Select Inscriptions, p.440.
5. Chinese Literature, 1956, no.3, p.153.

vate them. The history of feudalism in north India indicates that secular land-grants to officers and vassals probably took the religious grants as their prototypes.[1] We may suggest a parallel development from religious examples in the case of manorial rights in the case of secular chiefs of villages.

The villeins formed the largest group in the structure of society in medieval England, representing in association with the smaller peasantry approximately 70 per cent of the population.[2] After the Norman Conquest, economic and humanitarian motives, both the convenience of masters and the preaching of the Church, worked for the abolition of slavery in the proper sense of the term. The emancipation of a large number of slaves affected the social position of the class into which these were thrust and tended to drag down the villeins, who now became the lowest class, on the downward path to serfdom.[3] But in India we do not find such a situation. There always existed a class of slaves and landless labourers below the peasants. In England the sharp distinction between freeman and villein begins to emerge in the twelfth century with the growth of royal writs and possessory assizes. The king did not wish to interfere with the private jurisdiction which a lord had over his villeins and so

---

1. J.E.S.H.O., IV.103.
2. A.Lane Poole, Op. cit., p.12.
3. Ibid., pp.12f.

it became necessary to decide who could and who could not get the protection of his rights and property in the king's court.[1] But we do not find in the early medieval India any practical need or juristic keenness to determine the status of peasants. Here the class of slaves existed as distinct from all other social groups.

The reason why the manorial system did not become widespread in India was that there was not a total collapse of imperial machinery and commercial intercourse. We know that different empires rose in different parts and from time to time preserved the imperial administrative machinery in some form or other. Moreover, commercial intercourse between different parts of India, though slackened and lessened, was still considerable in volume. Thus there was not any great need for building up a new social and political system in the form of the manors. It is to be noted that the epigraphic records which testify to manorial tendencies belong to regions which represented backwaters in the economy of north India.

---

1. Ibid., p.13.

CHAPTER III - REVENUE SYSTEM

In the land grants of the period bhāgabhogakarahiraṇya, sometimes with a little variation, appears almost universally to denote the taxes and dues which the king received from a village. Generally it is included in the list of dues which the cultivators are directed to pay to the donee, but in some cases it is mentioned along with the rights and privileges, including dues, which accompanied the grant of the village. Out of this the part bhāgabhogakara has been variously interpreted. Kielhorn[1] translates it as share of the produce. U.N.Ghoshal[2] also takes it as one single expression and identifies it with the usual grain-share of the king, called bhāga in the Artha-śāstra and bali in the Smṛtis. Fleet[3] interprets bhāgabhoga to mean enjoyment of taxes. A.S.Altekar[4] splits the expression into two, bhāgakara being the land-tax and bhogakara representing petty taxes in kind paid to the king every day but in practice usually assigned to local officers. Generally however bhāga, bhoga and kara are taken to refer to three different taxes.[5] But the fundamental mistake in these views is that they do not

---

1. E.I., VII p.160.
2. H.R.S., p.214.
3. C.I.I., IV p.254 f.n.4.
4. Rāshṭrakūṭas and their times, pp.214-16.
5. Tripathi, History of Kanauj, p.348; R.K.Dikshit, J.U.P.H.S., XXIII p.243; Vogel, Antiquities of the Chamba State, pp.167-69; R.D.Banerji, E.I., XV no.23; D.C.Sircar, E.I., XXIX p.5 f.n.3; S.K.Maity, Economic Life, pp.57-60.

recognise the possibility of regional differences in the meanings of the revenue terms and try to impose a uniform interpretation. Moreover, we have to recognise the possibility of change in the import of some of these terms in course of time. We have a valuable contemporary reference to this possibility in the commentary of Medhātithi[1] who observes that the various kinds of royal dues are known by several names in several countries.

In any case it is clear that bhāgabhogakara denoted the most common and important due or dues which the king realised from a village. It is to be noted that in the twenty-one copper plate grants of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty from Kamauli bhāgabhogakara alone is mentioned in all the grants while it is the only tax mentioned in the plate of Govindacandra dated V.S.1178.[2] In some grants of the Pālas[3] kara is found in place of the more usual bhāgabhogakara. If bhāgabhogakara is used as contrasted with hiranya which generally follows the former, bhāgabhogakara may be taken to refer to the revenue generally paid in kind, irrespective of whether it refers to two different taxes or a single specific tax.[4] Two land-grants of the feudatories of

---

1. On Manu VIII.307 - baliprabhṛtīni rājagrāhyakaranāmāni deśabhede sūpamānavakavatprasiddhāni.
2. E.I., IV no. 11.
3. E.I., XVIII.304-7; I.A., XXI.256.
4. Cf. R.Niyogi, History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty, p.168.

Mahendrapāla from Kathiawar bring out the opposition between the two terms by mentioning them separately and not as a compound.[1] In the grants of some feudatory families from Bengal the usual expression is samastarājabhogakara in place of bhāgabhogakara.[2] This would also support the suggestion that, irrespective of the precise significance of its component parts, the expression bhāgabhogakara was often used to refer in a general way to the revenue paid in kind.

Sometimes we find the expression bhāgabhoga being used in place of bhāgabhogakara.[3] In some inscriptions the peasants are ordered to bring to the donee bhāgabhogakara whereas the grant of the village is described as accompanied by the right to bhagaboga.[4] It would follow from this that bhagabhoga stood for the revenue paid in kind. In some inscriptions only bhaga-bhoga is mentioned as the dues to be paid by the villagers to the donee.[5] Some grants from the region of Gujarat have the

---

1. E.I., IX no.1 (A and B). Cf. Prince of Wales Museum plates of Govindaraja, E.I., XXVI.252-5 - sahiranyādānah sabhogabhāgah.
2. E.I., XXXIII.138-40; XXX.257-9, 262-3.
3. C.I.I., IV pp.252-63.
4. Mahudi and Betma Plates of Paramāra Bhoja - E.I., XXXIII.217 XVIII.322-4; Mandhati Plates of Devapāla - E.I., IX.108-13. Also E.I., VII no.9 for a Kalacuri grant.
5. Kuretha grant of Pratihāra Malayavarman - E.I., XXX.148-50; Charkhari Plates of Candella Vīravarmadeva and Hammīravarma-deva - E.I., XX.133f, 135f.

form bhogabhāga in place of bhāgabhoga.[1] Fleet[2] takes bhāgabhoga and bhogabhāga alike as one expression meaning respectively 'enjoyment of shares' and 'share of the enjoyment'. It may be conceded that in some of the references, at least where the rights and privileges accompanying the village granted are enumerated, the expressions have the meaning suggested by Fleet. But the meaning at least of bhāgabhoga would not suit cases where it is mentioned along with other specific dues and objects which the villagers are ordered to bring to the donee. The expressions may be taken to refer in general to the revenues paid in kind. Significantly we find two Rāṣṭrakūṭa grants from Gujarat using bhogabhāga and dhānyāya as if they were interchangable.[3] Sometimes bhāgabhoga or bhogabhāga is mentioned along with dhānya.[4] U.N.Ghoshal[5] explains these cases by interpreting dhānya as a fixed contribution in kind as distinguished from the contribution consisting of a share of the produce. But the possibility cannot be ruled out that in order to make their list of privileges and rights as exhaustive as possible

---

1. E.I., XXVI.252-55; I no.8; VII no.6 for grants of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family; J.N.Banerjea Volume, pp.96ff for the grant of an Arab feudatory and I.A., XII.193-4 for the grant of a Cāpa feudatory.
2. C.I.I., III p.120 f.n.1.
3. E.I., I no.8; VII no.6.
4. J.N.Banerjea Volume, pp.96ff; C.I.I., III no.39.
5. H.R.S., pp.218f.

these plates incorporate terms which had almost identical import but were used in different regions and contexts.

There are indications to suggest that the expressions bhāgabhogakara or bhāgabhoga did not always indicate a single fiscal expression, and that their component parts stood for so many different taxes. In some records we find kara mentioned before bhāgabhoga[1] while in others it appears after bhāgabhoga but with the intervention of some other terms.[2] In a land-grant of the feudatory chief Mathanadeva bhāga and bhoga are mentioned separately as two distinct items of revenue.[3]

Bhāga has been generally explained by scholars as the king's customary share of the produce.[4] This is supported by Kairasvamin who quotes the Arthaśāstra text defining bhāga as one-sixth and the like payable to the king. Bhattasvamin also explains ṣaḍbhāga in the general sense of royal share (rājabhāga) and adds that it includes by implication other rates such as one-third and one-fourth prevailing in different tracts.

R.S.Tripathi had conjectured but without any evidence that

---

1. Ratnagiri plates of Somavaṃśī Karṇa - E.I., XXXIII.266-68.
2. Charkhari plates of Candella Paramardin - E.I., XX.129-31 - bhāgabhogapaśuhiraṇyakaraśulkādi.
3. E.I., III no.36.
4. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.290; D.C.Sircar, Select Inscriptions, p.372, f.n,7.
5. On Amara II.8.28.
6. On Artha, II.15; J.B.O.R.S., XI pt.III p.83.
7. I.H.Q., IX.128.

bhoga referred oto the rights that the landlord enjoyed when the land was left fallow or to the use of waste and taking of grass etc. from the field, when the cultivator's crops had been removed. R.K.Dikshit[1] and A.K.Majumdar[2] have explained bhoga in terms of eight bhogas of the records. South Indian inscriptions often describe villages and lands granted as accompanied by the aṣṭabhogas which they themselves sometimes define as consisting of the following eight privileges fixed by usage : (a) nidhi (treasure-trove), (b) nikṣepa (under-ground deposits), (c) jala (water-reservoirs), (d) pāṣāṇa (stones, mines, quarries), (e) akṣiṇī (actual privileges or present profit), (f) āgāmī (future profits), (g) siddha or siddhāya (land already brought under cultivation) and (h) sādhya (waste land that may in future be brought under cultivation)[3]. Eight would appear to have been the conventional number of these privileges. In the Kalegaon plates of Yādava Mahādeva[4] eleven types of enjoyment have been enumerated, besides others implied by the expression ityādi (etc.), and still they are called aṣṭabhogas. Again, this grant mentions only four of the enjoyments, nidhi, nikṣepa, jala and pāṣāṇa, from the traditional list. These enjoyments are in the nature of privileges and rights and do not fit in

---

1. J.U.P.H.S., XXIII.243.
2. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.248.
3. E.I., III.123, 245; XIII.34, f.n.1; XV.22; I.400; XXXII.42; I.A., XIX.244.
4. E.I., XXXII.42.

with most of the grants in northern India, where the villagers are orderedx to bring (samupanī) bhoga along with other dues and objects to the donee. We would feel that the original suggestion of BÜhler[1] that bhoga means the periodical supplies of fruits, fire-wood, flower and the like which the villagers had to furnish to the king is a better explanation of the term. This interpretation ~~of the~~ is supported by Manu[2] and the commentators Medhātithi and Kullūka.[3]

We can illustrate the wide divergence in the interpretations of the term kara by noting the explanations given by the commentators of Manu and the modern translators of the Arthaśāstra.[4] We feel that the term had many uses and their difference should be noticed in individual cases. There are many references where kara has been used in the most general sense of tax.[5] The meaning of bhāgabhogakara suggested by U.N.Ghoshal and A.S.Altekar is based on this use of the term. R.K.Dikshit[6] takes kara as meaning local taxes, but this is not supported by any independent evidence. Shamasastry translated kara at one place in the Arthaśāstra[7] as meaning taxes or subsidies paid by

---

1. E.I., I.75, f.n.
2. VII.118.
3. On Manu VIII.307.
4. S.K.Maity, Economic Life, pp.59f.
5. Cf. Medhātithi on Manu VIII.307 - baliprabhṛtīni rājagrāhyakaraṇāmāni.
6. J.U.P.H.S., XXIII.243.
7. Tr. p.58.

vassal kings and others. This is supported by references in inscriptions and literary works to kara or tribute being paid by kings or chiefs to their overlord. Thus the Rājataraṅgiṇī employs the word in the sense of tribute at many places.[1] But obviously this meaning would not suit the land-grants, where the villagers are ordered to bring kara along with other dues to the donee. We have pointed out earlier that in some of the grants of the Pālas kara has been used in place of bhāgabhoga-kara and, contrasted with hiraṇya, would seem to stand for the revenue paid in kind. In the dictionaries of the period kara, as also bali and bhāga(-dheya) appear as the common designations of the land tax.[2] In the commentaries of our period we find the term being used as the annual land-tax or as a periodical tax levied primarily upon agricultural land over and above the king's normal grain-share often fixed and calculated in the form of cash payment and sometimes as a property-tax, but in most cases associated with villages. Medhātithi[3] paraphrases it as the receipts of commodities (dravyādānam). But Kullūka explains it as the tax payable by villagers and townsmen either monthly or at Bhādrapada and Pauṣa. Rāghavānanda restricts it

---

1. VII.265-67, 991; VIII.1970. Cf. Allahabad Pillar Inscription, l.22 - sarvva-kara-dānājñākaraṇa-praṇāmāgamana etc.
2. Vaijayantī, p.107 l.89; Abhidhānaratnamālā, v.433.
3. On Manu VIII.307. Rāmacandra explains it as dues paid at military stations-gulmadāyādikam. S.K.Maity, Economic Life, p.59 translates it to mean contribution in the form of grass, wood, etc.

to a monthly payment by villagers. The Abhidhānarājendra quotes a text describing villages as liable to the kara, from which the towns were immune.[1] Bhaṭṭasvāmin[2] in his commentary on the Arthaśāstra defines the term as the annual tax paid during the month of Bhadrapada, Vesanta and the like. Abhayatilaka Gaṇi[3] explains kara as the share due to the king by one who has used the royal land for cultivation and grazing, it being payable during the harvesting season in corn. The Kṛtyakalpataru[4] describes kara as the receipt of fixed money from artisans and cultivators. Sarvajñanārāyaṇa also takes it to mean a fixed payment on land to be made in cash (bhūminiyataṃ deyaṃ hiraṇyaṃ). The Arthaśāstra text quoted by Kṣīrasvāmin[5] explains it as a charge upon all movable and immovable articles. Haribhadra Sūri in his commentary on the Kalpasūtra[6] interprets it as a property tax when describing it as the amount payable every year to the king on every cow and the like. We find it difficult to choose between these explanations. In any case the appearance of kara in the land-grants along with bhāga would suggest that here it is not to be translated as the usual land

---

1. s.v., gāmāgāra.
2. On Artha II.15; J.B.O.R.S., XI part III pp.83-84.
3. Dvyāśraya Kāvya, III.18.
4. Gārhasthya, p.255 - Karaḥ kārukṛṣīvalebhyo niyatadhanādānam
5. On Amara II.8.28.
6. p.253 q. by Pran Nath, Economic Conditions, p.59 f.n.3 - Karo gavādin prati prativarṣaṃ rājagrāhyaṃ dravyaṃ.

revenue. It might have been a periodical tax over and above the grain-share and was often realised from village people as a fixed amount calcualted on the basis of property like land and cows. As has been pointed out[1] the Junagadh rock inscription of Rudradāman[2] also suggests that kara was not a part of the regular land-tax but a special oppressive tax like viṣṭi (forced labour) and praṇaya (emergency tax or benevolence).

Hiranya also appears almost universally in the land-grants of the period. It occurs in the legal texts as well. Various interpretations of it have been offered. Often it is translated literally as gold.[3] Some other suggestions are tax in money,[4] payment in money[5] and tax in cash.[6] N.C.Bandyopadhyaya[7] explains it as a tax on the hoard or capital or on the annual income. Beni Prasad[8] interprets it as the right of the state to the gold and probably other mines as well. U.N.Ghoshal[9] proposes to take it as a tax in cash levied upon certain special kinds of crops

---

1. S.K.Maity, Economic Life, p.60.
2. E.I., VIII p.44.
3. Bühler, Jolly, Shamasastry, Meyer, Fleet, R.D.Banerji, D.R. Bhandarkar and N.G.Majumdar referred to by U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.60 f.n.5.
4. Senart, E.I., VII.61f.
5. Kielhorn, E.I., VII.160.
6. Vogel, Antiquities of the Chamba State, pp.167-69.
7. Kauṭilya, I pp.139f.
8. State in Ancient India, p.302.
9. Hindu Revenue System, p.62.

as distinguished from the tax in kind which was charged upon the ordinary crops, and this view has been generally accepted.[1] Here also we feel that the attempt to seek a uniform meaning for the term in all references, literary and epigraphic alike, creates confusion. Thus the explanation suggested by Ghoshal ill suits the use of the term in the legal works which speak of the king as receiving specific shares of hiraṇya along with those of other commodities.[2] Here hiraṇya would not be a tax but should be translated as 'gold', which in practice might have meant capital in the form of cash. We would not favour the meaning of hoard or mine for hiraṇya as the legal texts discuss the question of king's share in these two separately elsewhere. Hiraṇya could not be a tax on gold mines because though the term is found in the inscriptions from almost all parts of northern India we do not think so much gold could have been produced everywhere as to form a regular source of revenue. In the land-grants where hiraṇya has been contrasted with dhānya it may mean cash. Likewise where it is used as opposed to bhāgabhogakara it is best explained as dues paid in cash. We would suggest that it refers to lump assessment in cash upon villages as distinguished from the king's grain-share assessed

---

1. D.C.Sircar, Select Inscriptions, p.372, f.n.7.
2. Gautama X.25; Viṣṇu III.25; Manu VII.130-32; Agni Purāṇa CCXXIII.27-29.

upon the individual cultivators. As has been rightly noticed by U.N.Ghoshal[1] in some of the Pāla grants piṇḍaka has been used in place of hiraṇya. Piṇḍaka would appear to have been the same as piṇḍakara of the Arthaśāstra[2] which has been explained by Bhaṭṭasvāmin as comprising taxes levied upon whole villages. The prevalence of this practice is testified to by some inscriptions of Bengal which mention the annual revenue calculated in cash for fields and villages. D.C.Sircar[3] convincingly explains the letters sāṃ hi used in this context as being abbreviations of the expression sāṃvatsarika hiraṇya. The practice would appear to have been known to Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, the commentator of Manu,[4] who explains kara as the fixed cash to be paid on land (bhūminiyataṃ deyaṃ hiraṇyaṃ). In the Mallasarul (Burdwan) grant,[5] a little earlier than our period, the list of officers includes hiraṇya-sāmudāyika who collected the dues called hiraṇya. The suggestion of U.N.Ghoshal that certain crops were taxed in cash appears to be unlikely because in that case we have to postulate separate administrative machinery for realising the revenue from ordinary crops and from crops which were difficult to divide in shares. There is however no such

---

1. H.R.S., pp.244f.
2. II.15.
3. E.I., XXX p. 55.
4. VIII.307.
5. E.I., XXIII.159ff.

difficulty if we accept the explanation suggested here. The parallel case of officers known as āgrahārika who supervised āgrahāra villages would go to support our suggestion that hiraṇyasāmudāyika was the officer who collected the lump revenue in cash from villages so assessed.

In the grants of the Gupta and post-Gupta periods the terms udraṅga and uparikara are of frequent occurrence. In our period we find them mostly confined to western India.[1] These two fiscal terms generally appear together, thereby creating the impression that they have been used antithetically. But there are instances where these terms have been used separately.[2] Thus in a grant of the Pratihāra chief Mathanadeva and in some of the grants of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas[3] we find only udraṅga, whereas the grants of the Pālas and the Paramāras mention only uparikara. Despite desperate attempts to explain

---

1. J.B.B.R.A.S., XX no.9; I.A., XIV pp.196ff; Chinchani Plates of the Arab feudatory Sugatipa-J.N.Banerjea Volume, pp.96ff; feudatories of the Pratihāra king Mahendrapāla-E.I., IX no.1 (A and B); Hansot Plates of Bhartṛvaḍḍha III-E.I., XII.197.
2. E.I., III no.36.
3. E.I., I no.8; VII no.6.
4. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.243.
5. Ibid., p.260. Also Mandhata Plates of Devapāla-E.I., IX.108-13; Ratnagiri Plates of Somavaṃśī Karṇa-E.I., XXXIII.266-68.
6. S.K.Maity, Economic Life, p.62 suggests either that udraṅga may be the same as draṅga and is a sort of police tax levied on the district, for the maintenance of the local police station or that it is connected with udaka and to be interpreted as a water-tax. But these attempts based on the slender similarity in sound do not carry us far. A still better suggestion of the same type would be to equate it with

(Continued

these terms there has been no satisfactory suggestion hitherto. U.N.Ghoshal[1] interprets udraṅga as the tax levied on permanent tenants and uparikara as the tax on temporary cultivators. We have elsewhere suggested that udraṅga and uparikara may be equated with kḷipta and upakḷipta of other records.[2] Kḷipta is known to have been used in the Arthaśāstra[3] in the sense of a fixed tax. Upakḷipta may therefore mean an extra cess on the cultivators over and above the fixed revenue of the state.[4] A.S. Altekar[5] equates udraṅga and uparikara respectively with bhāga-kara and bhogakara into which he splits the expression bhāga-

---

continued)
utsaṅga in the Arthaśāstra, II.15 which has been defined by Bhaṭṭasvāmin as what is paid by the inhabitants of the city and country-part on the occasion of some festive event such as the birth of a prince.

1. pp.210f. D.C.Sircar, Select Inscriptions, p.371 f.n.5 explains udraṅga in this fashion but differs as regards uparikara. Fleet (C.I.I., III p.98 f.n.1), Hoernle (J.A.S.B., LXVI pp. 128f) and B.K.Barua (Cultural History of Assam, I pp.81f) explain uparikara as a tax on cultivators who have no proprietary rights in the soils.
2. J.I.H., XXXVIII.587-88.
3. II.6.
4. In the Kṛtyakalpataru, Vyavahāra, pp.535f upakḷipta has been explained as objects which have been made fit for being consumed ("upakḷiptāni" upayoga-yogyatām nītāni). It may therefore refer to bhoga of other grants which is generally explained as the periodical supply of flowers, fruits, vegetable, grass etc.
5. Rāshṭrakūṭas and their times, pp.214f. D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.211 holds that bhoga and udraṅga are synonymous, but not bhoga and uparikara as both are used together in a record. However, the contention that udraṅga and bhāga are never used together in inscriptions is not justified. See C.I.I., III no.39; J.N.Banerjea Volume, pp.96-109; E.I., IX no. 1 (A and B).

bhogakara. V.V.Mirashi[1] holds that udraṅga and uparikara correspond both to kḷipta and upakḷipta and to bhāga and bhoga. Though udraṅga and uparikara are generally not used with bhāga and bhoga there are some cases where they are so used. This weakens the suggestion that the two pairs of terms are synonymous. We may however suggest that these antithetical groups of udraṅga and uparikara, bhāga and bhoga and dhānya and hiraṇya were overlapping in their import and referred to the land revenue and allied state income from slightly different standpoints. The composer of the grants, in order to convey the idea of the full rights of the owners, sometimes used these terms together. However the possibility cannot be ruled out that udraṅga and uparikara refer to two specific additional state impositions whose nature cannot now be determined[2]. Thus we see that the Mallasarul grant referred to earlier[3] includes in its list an officer called audraṅgika, who must have been charged with the realisation of this impost. The formation of the term uparikara would in any case indicate that it was an extra tax charged over and above the land revenue (upari means upon, extra or super). The oppressive character of this impost

---

1. C.I.I., IV p. cxli.
2. It has been suggested that these refer to two kinds of very common additional impositions on the excess income of the people, to be paid in cash or kind-P.I.H.C., XIX.93. But unfortunately the summary is silent about the grounds for this view.
3. E.I., XXIII.159ff.

is testified to by certain inscriptions of our period from Assam.[1] Thus the grants of Ratnapāla and Indrapāla include uparikara tax among the oppressions from which the land is exempted, while in a grant of Balavarman the officer charged with the uparikara tax is mentioned in the list of oppressors who were not to enter the land granted.[2]

Another fiscal term which is very common in the grants of our period is daśāparādha sometimes mentioned as daśāparādha-daṇḍa[3], daṇḍadaśāparādha[4] and daśāpacāra[5]. U.N.Ghoshal[6] explains the term as the right of a donee to be exempted at least in part from the ordinary penalties for the commission of some traditional offences by the villagers. The suggestion would not be applicable to all land-grants but only to those of the Senas[7] and some other kings in Bengal[8] in which the form of the expression is sahyadaśāparādha (with toleration for ten offences). From the commentary of Haribhadra Sūri on the Kalpasūtra[9] we

---

1. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.248.
2. L.D.Barnett treats uparikara as analogous to the Tamil mel-varam (the crown's share of produce) as mel = Skt. uparī - J.R.A.S., 1931 p.165. V.V.Mirashi, C.I.I., IV p. cxli makes it an additional tax which may have included the miscellaneous taxes in kind paid by traders and artisans.
3. E.I., II.359-64 - grant of Govindacandra.
4. E.I., IX no.1 (A and B) - feudatories of Madanapāla.
5. E.I., XV.295-8 - grant of Vigrahapāla III.
6. H.R.S., pp.219f.
7. Ibid., p.264.
8. E.I., XXX.262-63.
9. p.253 q. by Pran Nath, Economic Conditions, p.59, f.n.3- Adaṃḍa kodaṃḍimaṃ = Daṇḍo yathāparādha-rājagrāhyaṃ dhanaṃ, kudaṇḍo mahatyaparādhe alpaṃ rājagrāhyaṃ dhanaṃ tābhyāṃ rahitaṃ.

learn of the exemption granted from the complete or partial payment of fines for offences. We have seen elsewhere that in general the term is to be explained as meaning the right to the fine realised for ten offences committed by the villagers.[1] It is interesting to note that U.N.Ghoshal[2] himself admits that the phrase undoubtedly stands for a kind of income accruing to the king from the villages, since it is included along with the contributions in grain and in domestic animals in a list of the king's receipts (utpatti) in the Cambay grant of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Govinda IV.[3] Its position in the grant, its form as sadaśāparādha and not as adaśāparādha and the fact of its being granted even to institutions like temples[4] and not merely to individuals suggest that it does not refer to an immunity from the fines to certain offences but to a positive right in the form of income from the fines imposed on villagers for committing any of the ten offences. As rightly pointed out by P.V.Kane[5] no king would ever think of exempting doneee in pious grants or the villages in those grants from the results of such grave offences as the murder of a woman, adultery, theft and abortion. Similar

---

1. J.I.H., XXXVIII pp.589f.
2. Op. cit., p.220.
3. E.I., VII p.36.
4. C.I.I., III no.46.
5. History of Dharmaśāstra, III.264-66.

rights of income in the shape of receipts from fines are granted to the donees in the land-grants of the Candellas[1], the Kalacuris[2] and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas[3]. The Bombay Secretariat grant of Caulukya king Ajayapāla[4] has a more graphic expression meaning the receipts from the fines for offences (daṇḍa-doṣa-prāptādāya). In the fragmentary grant of Govinda IV from Ujjain[5] we have a very clear reference to the fines inflicted on the commission of ten offences being granted along with other incomes. From the Lekhapaddhati[6] we learn that in farming out a village the overlord reserved for himself the income from five specified offences. The term daśāparādha would refer to the transfer to the donee of similar rights to receive fines from certain offences. B.C.Mazumdar[7] holds that the term implies the donee's right of jurisdiction over the offences committed. In all these grants the villagers residing in the village granted are asked by the king to obey the orders (ājñā-śravaṇa) of the donee. But this cannot be construed to refer to the orders passed in dealing with suits. At most it stands for occasional

---

1. I.A., XVI p.201.
2. E.I., II no. 23 - daṇḍadāyakarotpatti.
3. I.A., XIX p.165.
4. I.A., XVIII.80.
5. E.I., XXIII.106-8 - sa-vṛkṣamālāku(lam) sa-dhānyahiraṇyadeya sa-daṇḍadoṣanda(-da)śāparādhaṃ samasto(tpa)ttiśulkotpatti-sahitam.
6. pp.12, 16 (for the specification of the fines).
7. J.B.O.R.S., 1916, p.53 f.n.

services rendered to the donee. We know that the Indian legal tradition does not grant śrenī and gaṇa tribunals jurisdiction to sit in judgment over cases of violent crime (sāhasa). It would be quite opposed to this tradition if we postulate that any private individual was given such a right.[1] The inscriptions of the Pālas[2] and a grant of Lalitāsuradeva from Kumaon[3] mention an officer called daśāparādhika. It may be suggested that this officer was authorised to deal with cases falling under daśāparādha and the donee was entitled only to the fines imposed for the commission of the ten offences.

There has been some speculation about the ten offences coming under the term. Bühler[4] had conjectured that the ten faults refer to the ten actions about land possible under the sīmāvāda prakaraṇa. But the use of the term aparādha refers to offences of a more serious nature. Fleet[5] took the term to refer to a classification in the Dharmasindhusāra[6] of Kāśīnāthopādhyāya and Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya[7] of Vāgbhaṭa of three specified sins of the body, three of the mind, and four of speech. But, as

---

1. P.V.Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.264-66.
2. E.g., E.I., XVII p.321; I.A., XV p.306.
3. I.A., XXV p.18.
4. I.A., V p.115 f.n.3.
5. C.I.I., III pp. 189 f.n.4.
6. II.19ff.
7. Sūtrasthāna, ch.1, vv.21f (Bombay, 1880, p.38).

has been rightly pointed out[1], it is highly improbable that the offences of the mind are made the subject of legal punishment. Jolly[2] enumerated the ten crimes after Nārada[3], who gives them as disobedience to the king's order, murder of a woman, intermixture of the castes, adultery, theft, pregnancy from one not the husband, abuse and defamation, obscenity, assault, and abortion. The list with some differences is also attributed to Saṃvarta[4]. The Śukranīti[5] also mentions the ten offences in the form given by Nārada. But Hiralal[6] identified the ten aparādhas of the inscriptions with ten sins enumerated in another passage of the Śukranīti[7]. But this is not sound because the second list is of moral sins, several of which are obviously outside the reach of the law, whereas the first list which is also found in Nārada enumerates ten aparādhas or offences which were met with fine. Beni Prasad[8] is in favour of interpreting daśāparādha in the sense of judicial fines in general. This suggestion would seem to be likely because, as we have seen, in the land grants of some of the dynasties we have reference to the

---

1. Beni Prasad, State in Ancient India, p.303.
2. Hindu Law and Customs, pp.268,70.
3. I.11ff.
4. q. by the Smrticandrikā, II p.28.
5. IV.5.161-64.
6. E.I., IX p.47 f.n.1.
7. III.6.
8. State in Ancient India, p.303.

right to the receipts from fines in general in place of those from ten offences. Then the list of the ten offences practically covers all important crimes. But the very fact that daśāparādha and not some term covering fines in general has been mentioned would suggest that the right was restricted only to ten specified offences.

In the land-grants of the Gāhaḍavāla kings we find long lists of fiscal terms, some of which do not appear elsewhere and have baffling forms difficult to explain. Of these pravaṇikara would appear to have been a very common and important item of revenue being mentioned in nineteen out of the twenty-one grants of the dynasty recovered from Kamauli.[1] Outside the Gāhaḍavāla empire the expression occurs only in a grant of a Somavaṃśī king of Trikaliṅga.[2] However, the grants of the Kalacuris of Tripuri[3] sometimes mention pravaṇi as one of the items of state income transferred to the donee. R.S.Tripathi[4] suggests that pravaṇikara was either a tax on turnpikes, intended to preserve the peace of the village by discouraging the advent of large numbers of visitors or a tax for the upkeep of the road. This is a possible interpretation, as pravaṇa means road-crossing (catuṣpatha). But we have to

---

1. E.I., IV no.1t.
2. E.I., XI no.14.
3. C.I.I., IV pp.324-31, 645-52.
4. History of Kanauj, p.348. Seex also R.Niyogi, History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty, p.176.

account for the substitution of i for a in pravaṇa. R.Niyogi[1] has suggested that it was the tax paid for the services of the state guides posted in every village, whose duty probably was to escort and guide the merchants from the interior of the country to the highway crossing leading to the next village or town. The interpretation of pravaṇi as a state guide of the type postulated by R.Niyogi is far-fetched and such a tax would not appear to have been so important as would follow from its frequent occurrence in the land-grants. U.N.Ghoshal[2] suggests it to be a tax on pravaṇis whom he describes as some class of merchants. Leumann[3] takes pravaṇi to mean a retail dealer or perhaps a second hand dealer. Mirashi[4] suggests that it means a banker (śreṣṭhin). In the Rajor inscription of Mathanadeva[5] pravaṇi follows vaṇik (merchant) in the list of villagers addressed. We would favour the suggestion made by U.N.Ghoshal[6] that pravaṇikara was analogous to the toll or śulka of the technical literature and inscriptions. The prominence of pravaṇikara in the list of incomes granted in the Gāhaḍavāla and Kalacuri records also supports the suggestion. In both cases pravaṇikara or pravaṇi is mentioned at the top of the list

---

1. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.176.
2. H.R.S., p.263.
3. E.I., III, Additions and Corrections, p.viii.
4. C.I.I., IV.324-31.
5. E.I., III.266-67.
6. H.R.S., p.263.

second only to bhāgabhogakara or bhāgakara. We have seen that in the Gāhaḍavāla records from Kamauli[1] pravaṇikara occurs more frequently than the other minor taxes and is second only to bhāgabhogakara. In the grant of a Somavaṁśī king referred to above pravaṇikara is one of the two taxes mentioned, the other being kṣetrakara. The interpretation of pravaṇikara as toll (śulka) would be further supported by the fact that none of these inscriptions having pravaṇikara or pravaṇi mentionsx śulka, which is prominently mentioned in other records as an important and common source of state income.

The term turuṣkadaṇḍa is found exclusively in the land-grants of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty. It was levied by Candradeva, the first real founder of the dynasty; it appears in the first land-grant of the family dated V.S.1148 and continues to appear in the records of Madanacandra, Govindacandra and E Vijayacandra. But it is not to be found in the grants of Jayaccandra and his son Harišcandra, suggesting thereby that it was abolished by Jayaccandra.[2] An early suggestion[3] to interpret turuṣkadaṇḍa as a tax on aromatic reeds finds no supporter among modern scholars. The existing theories have been elaborately discussed by R.Niyogi.[4] Some scholars[5] hold that this tax

---

1. E.I., XI no.14.
2. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., pp.177-78.
3. J.A.S.B., LVI p.113.
4. Op.cit., pp.176-81.
5. C.V.Vaidya, History of Medieval Hindu India, III p.211; D.C. Ganguly in Struggle for Empire, p.51.

was realised to make annual payments of tribute to the Sultān of Ghazni and that to enforce the regular payment of this tribute the Muslims from time to time led expeditions against northern India. But there is no definite proof to establish the domination of the Ghaznavides over the Gāhaḍavālas in any period of their history. The identification of Cānd Rāi, who helped Mahmūd, with Candradeva is doubtful. In any case the records of the Gāhaḍavālas show that from 1091 A.D. onwards Candradeva was an independent ruler. The continuance of the tax in later reigns when the dynasty had reached glorious heights would ill suit the suggestion that it was reminiscent of their earlier subordinate status. In the Muslim accounts Ala-ud-daulah is said to have defeated but released on payment of a large sum of money Malhi, king of Kanauj who is identified with Madanacandra. But a parallel victory over the Turks has been claimed by Govindacandra in the reign of his father Madanacandra. Not only Govindacandra but also his son Vijayacandra claim to have repulsed the attacks of the Muslims. As has been pointed out, "even the Turki claim does not go so far as payment of tributes regularly at stated intervals by the Gāhaḍavālas. Had a tax been levied specifically to pay the tribute to the Turks, why should there be fresh attacks again and again?"[1]

---

1. B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p.127 f.n.

Following V.A.Smith[1] scholars generally interpret the term to mean the tax levied to meet the cost of resisting the Turkish invaders.[2] Altekar[3] refers to a similar tax levied by the Cola king Vīrarājendra to finance his war against the Cālukyas of Veṅgi. R.Niyogi[4] demonstrates how this interpretation suits the known history of this tax. It is argued that after the establishment of the strong Cāhamāna power between the Gāhaḍavāla and Turk dominions and in view of the increasing weakness of the later Yāminī Sultāns Jayaccandra thought that the Turuṣka menace was over and abolished the tax, for which he found no justification. But this suggestion does not explain the absence of the tax in the records of the closing years of the reign of Jayaccandra and also the reign of his son Hariścandra. In this period the Turuṣka menace was really overwhelming the empire and the revival of the old tax had every justification. Another objection would be that if the tax was meant to raise funds to fight the menace of the Turks there was not much

---

1. Early History of India (4th ed.), p.400 f.n.
2. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.263; A.S.Altekar, State and Government, p. 277; K.V.R.Aiyangar, Kṛtyakalpataru, Rājadharma, Introduction, p.53, f.n.1; R.Niyogi, Op.cit., pp.180-81.
3. Loc.cit. Following S.Lévi, U.N.Ghoshal, loc.cit., p.233 proposes a similar interpretation for mallakara mentioned in the records of the Licchavi kings.
4. Loc.cit.

propriety in granting it to a brāhmaṇa.[1] The donor king could very well have transferred other state dues to the donee and retained the turuṣkadaṇḍa for himself. We know from records of some such dues or state receipts which the king did not grant to the donee as they were meant to fulfil certain specific tasks like the one contemplated for the turuṣkadaṇḍa.[2]

We would suggest that the term stood for a tax collected from the Turuṣka settlers in the kingdom. This explanation was originally offered by Sten Konow[3] and has received occasional support from scholars.[4] The initial objection raised against the view is that daṇḍa or fine is a penal measure and cannot technically be described as a tax.[5] But we do have some references where daṇḍa has been used in the general sense of a tax. R.Niyogi herself quotes a Yādava inscription[6] in which daṇḍa means a contribution which is not a penalty. Likewise we have suvarṇadaṇḍa, ahidaṇḍa and vartmadaṇḍa in the Kelga Plates of Someśvaradeva[7] and hastidaṇḍa, haladaṇḍa and bandhadaṇḍa in the

---

1. This objection is all the more applicable aginst the first theory discussed above which seeks to explain the term as tribute collected for the Sultān of Ghazni.
2. Coravarjjam, cauravarjjam or coradrohakavarjjam. See J.I.H., XXXVIII.590f. See D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.187 II for an epigraphic reference that balādhipābhāvya was not transferred to the grantee by the original donor of a village.
3. E.I., IX p.321.
4. B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p.126.
5. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.179.
6. I.A., XIV p.318 - vasati-daṇḍa-prayāṇa-daṇḍau.
7. E.I., XXVIII.324-6.

Ratnagiri Plates of Somavaṁśī Karṇa.[1] The Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] refers to maṅgalyadaṇḍa or taxes levied on auspicious occasions. In the Rājanītiratnākara[3] daṇḍa has been used in connection with the dues and tributes which a feudatory pays to his overlord. In the commentary of Medhātithi[4] the term daṇḍa at one place is explained as intended to include taxes (kara), tolls (śulka) and the like. The geographical references in the land-grants indicate that the turuṣkadaṇḍa was collected from all parts of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion.[5] It had therefore been argued that if the term is to be explained as a fine collected from the Turuṣka prisoners, we have to make the unlikely presumption that in many villages even in the remote parts of the Gāhaḍavāla dominion Turuska prisoners were billetted in considerable numbers.[6] But the objection is not much to the point. There is no need to restrict the scope of the tax to prisoners only. It was realised from Turuṣkas in general. As regards the geographical distribution of the Turuṣka population it may be said that the fiscal terms are in the form of set formulae of the important sources of state income and it does not necessarily

---

1. E.I., XXXIII.266-8.
2. VIII.565-68.
3. p.4 - Adhīśvaro dvividhaḥ śauryyādakaraḥ samrādanugrahādakaraḥ. Ādyaḥ svecchayaiva daṇḍādi dadāti. Dvitīyopyanugrahāt. Cf. Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpurusacarita, IV.24 - diśodaṇḍaḥ.
4. On Manu IX.323-Daṇḍagrahaṇam karaśulkādināmapi pradarśanārtham vyācakṣate.
5. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.177.
6. Ibid., p.179.

mean that all these taxes were equally important for each village granted. Moreover, as we have seen[1], there are many indications that Muslim population in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom was by no means insignificant. Besides this Muslim merchants were also frequenting northern India. Sten Konow[2] had described turuṣkadaṇḍa as a Hindu Jizya. Scholars find it difficult to reconcile this description of the tax with the Indian tradition of extreme tolerance of other religions[3]. There is however nothing improbable about such a punitive tax. Several inscriptions from southern India, of which the earliest is the grant of Siṃhavarman Pallava (c.450 A.D.) and the latest the Guḍihalli inscription dated 1346 A.D.[4] mention the Ājīvika tax along with other general taxes which accompanied the grant of a village and which was a special tax on the Ājīvika laymen, the Ājīvikas appearing to have been held in general disfavour[5]. In two of these inscriptions[6] the Ājīvika poll-tax is referred to in close association with the tax on the Uvaccas. Significantly enough the term Uvaccas is sometimes used in Tamil for Muslim settlers,

---

1. See infra pp. 190-91.
2. Op.cit.
3. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.179.
4. A.L.Basham, History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas, pp.187-90.
5. Ibid., pp.191f.
6. Tiruvorriyur inscription (dated 1223 A.D.) of the reign of Rājarāja III - A.L.Basham, loc., cit., p.188 no.6 - Āṉuvikal-pērār-kkoṇ and Uvaiccar-pērār-kuti-k-kāṇum; Padavedu inscription dated 1259 A.D. - A.L.Basham, loc.cit., p.189 no.10 - Uvaccan-per-k-kaṭamai and Āṉuvikān-per-k-kaṭamai.

and Hultzsch[5] interpreted it in this sense.[1] We however feel that the motive was not religious antagonism alone but mostly economic considerations. We have elsewhere[2] suggested that the Pratihāra kings imposed checks and restrictions to discourage the influx of Muslim merchants. It is quite possible that the Gāhaḍavālas followed this policy but did not impose a total ban on them and imposed a tax on them which must have provided a valuable source of income. The last objection that has been raised against this interpretation of the term is that it does not explain the discontinuance of the tax from the beginning of the reign of Jayaccandra.[3] We may suggest that it was to appease the Turks that Jayaccandra and his son abolished this tax.

Recently there have been some attempts to explain the fiscal term which appears in the Gāhaḍavāla grants as kumaragadiāṇaka or with slight variations in spelling as kumaragadīaṇaka, kumaragadiyaṇaka or kumāragadiaṇaka.[4] Thus B.P.Mazumdar[5] suggests that it was a tax in gold coins known as kumāragadyāṇa. But there is no other indication of the existence of coins of this name. On the basis of a south Indian inscription, which speaks of land under the kumari cultivation by the hill tribes,[6] XX

---

1. S.I.I., I p. 82, n.4.
2. See infra pp. 191-93.
3. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.180.
4. Ibid., p.183.
5. Socio-Economic History, p.237.
6. E.C., X pp.86ff.

R.Niyogi[1] suggests that it was the tax imposed on land under kumri cultivation carried on in some places in the hill areas and the forest tracts in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom, and that the Gāhaḍavālas adopted this tax from south India, where the cultivators were required to pay an amount equal to one gadyāṇaka for some specified measure, and even retained the south Indian coin name gadyāṇaka. But the references to this tax indicate that it was one of the important items of state income, in any case not so insignificant as is implied by the interpretation proposed above. It does not appear that kumari or kumri cultivation was so widely resorted to in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom as to become a common tax. Further, it is to be noted that the form of the first part of the expression is kumara and in some cases kumāra. Kumāra means a prince and kumara represents the intermediate stage in the transformation of kumāra into kuṁvara or kuṁara. In the stray plate from Nanana (Marwar)[2] belonging to the twelfth century we have an interesting reference to a due which has been called both kumaradrona and kumāradrona. This plate would suggest that the dues realised for the kumāra or prince were not confined, as is generally supposed, to the Gāhaḍavāla empire

---

1. Op.cit., p.183. It has been claimed that the Yuktikalpataru (p.6) explains the kumari or kumri cultivation as shifty (sic) cultivation. But we fear that the reference given contains no such information.
2. E.I., XXXIII.244-45 (ll.2-8, 10-16).

but were found elsewhere with only this difference that whereas in other states they were generally determined in kind, the Gāhaḍavālas collected them in cash. This plate helps us in determining the nature of the due. It records that out of the kumaradroṇas of wheat realised from the water-machine (araghaṭṭa) at a certain village five droṇas were allotted to a certain temple-dancer (mehari). It would appear that the tax had a more regular character than is implied when it is explained as a present or nazrānā of ₹ a gadyāṇaka on the birth of a prince.[1] U.N.Ghoshal[2] had suggested to interpret it as a tax on behalf of the royal princes at the rate of so much per gadyāṇaka. But the analogy of the kumaradroṇas in the stray plate would indicate that gadyāṇaka like droṇas stood for the actual tax realised. In this plate the tax on behalf of the kumāra realised from the water-machine would seem to have been more than five droṇas. The tax of the Gāhaḍavāla grants may be suggested to have been one gadyāṇaka per family annually. Though kumāra means prince[3] it is not unlikely that the tax was by way of present to members of the royal family in general.

Kūṭaka also appears only in the land-grants of the Gāhaḍa-

---

1. V.V.Mirashi in J.N.S.I., VII.29.
2. H.R.S., p.294.
3. The editor of the plate from Nanana had taken kumara as the name of the lease of the araghatta who used to pay the annual rent for it in wheat-E.I., XXXIII.241.

vālas. U.N.Ghoshal[1] has left the term unexplained. B.P.Mazumdar[2] explains it as a tax on each kūṭaka weight of a commodity. But we find the suggestion of R.Niyogi[3] to be better. If the reading kuṭaka found in some records is to be accepted then it refers to a tax on houses, as according to the dictionaries kuṭa means a house. But the more usual spelling is kūṭaka[4] and it may be taken to stand for a plough-tax because kūṭa means a plough and kūṭaka an ploughshare. In the Mayanāmatī songs a plough tax is mentioned as only a pice and a half per plough a month.[5] The earliest epigraphic reference to a plough-tax (halikēkara) is found in the grants of the Uccakalpas.[6]

Jalakara[7] has been mentioned in a few inscriptions of the Gāhaḍavālas beginning with the Gagaha inscription of Govindacandra dated V.S. 1199.[8] On the basis of the expression samatsyākara included in the list of rights accompanying the grant R.Niyogi[9] says that fish was a source of revenue in this period

---

1. H.R.S., p.294.
2. Socio-Economic History, p.233.
3. Op.cit., p.183.
4. In the Allahabad Museum Plate of Govindacandra (E.I., XXXIII. 178-80) kūḍI is obviously a mistake for kūṭaka.
5. T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, p.268.
6. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.213. Cf. sahala in the Rithapur plates of Bhavattavarman - E.I., XIX.102f.
7. There is no justification for the emendation jātakara proposed by Kielhorn, E.I., IV.117-20.
8. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.173.
9. Ibid., pp.173f.

and hence takes jalakara as a tax on the produce of water, fish for example. But we would prefer the more obvious interpretation of the term as irrigation cess. We may point out that sajala also appears in the list of rights transferred to the donee and hence water was also a source of revenue.

Gokara is also mentioned in those among the Gāhaḍavāla grants which refer to jalakara.[1] There have been several speculations about the precise nature of this tax on cows. Generally on the analogy of the tax called nalla or good cows in south Indian inscriptions[2] it is taken to be a tax on the breeding of cows.[3] The Arthaśāstra[4] recommends such a tax during a financial crisis. On the basis of the reference to taxes on the sale and tending of cattle in the Arthaśāstra[5], R.Niyogi[6] has suggested the possibility of gokara being a tax on the sale of cows in the villages. The alternative interpretation offered by R.S.Tripathi[7] is that it was the charge covering grazing rights. B.P.Mazumdar[8], relying on a Śukranīti[9] passage which forbids the king from collecting taxes on the milk of cows and rice for family consump-

---

1. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.173.
2. Gupta, Land System, p.363.
3. R.S.Tripathi in I.H.Q., IX.129.
4. V.2.
5. II.29-30.
6. Op.cit., p.174.
7. I.H.Q., IX.129.
8. Socio-Economic History, p.237.
9. IV.2.127.

tion, describes gokara as a tax on the milk of cows. It is very difficult to choose between these suggestions. We must also consider the possibility that gokara was a general cattle-tax like the paśu of the Candella inscription. The legal works postulate a tax on cattle at the rate of 1/50.[1]

The Rohan grant of Govindacandra dated V.S. 1166[2] refers to a tax named valadī. U.N.Ghoshal[3] leaves it unexplained. B.P. Mazumdar[4] takes it to mean a tax for recruitment of the army. But the form of the term is not valādi but valadī. Balada in Hindi is derived from Sanskrit vardda and means a bullock.[5] The Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa[6] of Dāmodara Paṇḍita, associated with the Gāhaḍavāla court, uses valada as meaning a bullock. Now there can be many possible explanations of the word as a fiscal term. R.Niyogi[7] suggests it to be a tax on the breeding of bulls like the nallerudu (good bull) of a south Indian inscription.[8] It is also likely that it has been used in place of the gokara of other grants. B.N.S.Yadav[9] takes it as a special tax on plough-

---

1. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., pp.60f.
2. I.A., XVIII.17.
3. H.R.S., p.299.
4. Socio-Economic History, p.235.
5. Bhāṣā Śabda Kosa ed. Rāmāśaṅkara Śukla 'Rasāla', s.v. balada. See also Saṃkṣipta Hindī Śabda Sāgara ed. Rāmacaṃdra Varmā, s.v., balada.
6. p. 40 I.6-rāda valada joda (= raddo balīvarddān jodayati). Cf. Dohākosa, p.361 (XVI.4).
7. Op.cit., p.183.
8. Gupta, Land System, p.333.
9. Some Aspects of Society in Northern India in the 12th century A.D. (Thesis approved for the D.Phil. degree of the University of Allahabad), p.291 f.n.1.

bullocks. Another possibility is to interpret it in line with Śpāramparabalīvaddagahaṇam of the grant of Pallava Śivaskandavarman[1] as the right to have from the villers bullocks in relays for transport.

Lavaṇakara, mentioned only in the Machlishahr grant of Hariścandra dated V.S.1253[2], may be explained as the tax on the private manufacture of salt which from the list of rights transferred to the donee in the Gāhaḍavāla grants is known to have been a state monopoly.[3]

Parṇakara also appears only in the above-mentioned Machlishahr grant. It may be taken to refer to the tax on the collection of grass and wood. But parṇa meaning leaves is not a happy term for grass and wood. We wonder if it could have been a tax on betel leaves.

Daśabandha is mentioned in two Gāhaḍavāla inscriptions.[4] In Manu[5] the term is used for a fine on witnesses in cases of loans of money who do not appear. In the Arthaśāstra[6] it means the share of one-tenth of the produce given by a landlord to a

---

1. Select Inscriptions, pp.437ff.
2. E.I., X.95.
3. Cf. sa-loha-lavaṇākaraḥ.
4. Basahi grant of V.S.1161 - I.A., XIV.103; Kamauli (Banaras) grant of V.S. 1162 - E.I., II.260. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.170 does not take any notice of the second reference.
5. VIII.107.
6. (Tr.) p.200.

to a cultivator or labourer. K.A.N.Sastri[1] prefers to interpret this term as it appears in the inscriptions of south India to refer to the ear-marking for a specified public purpose of one-tenth of a given source of revenue.[2] In the Gāhaḍavāla grants the term appears to have been used as a tax of one-tenth of the income. This would be supported by the Cāhamāna inscription from Nadol dated 1143 A.D.[3] which records that a certain rāṇaka exempted the dancing girls of a temple from paying daśabandha. It is interesting to note that the Lekhapaddhati[4] records the sale of a horse in which the daśabandha to be paid actually amounts to one-tenth of the price.

The Basahi plate of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra[5] mentions three fiscal terms akṣapaṭalaprastha, pratīhāraprastha and viśatiaṭhūprastha. U.N.Ghoshal[6] took these terms as referring to contributions of so much per prastha payable by the villagers on account of the officers concerned. B.P.Mazumdar[7] explains viśatiaṭhūprastha as a tax on each prasthaka weight of commodity and pratīhāraprasthaka as a tax collected on some commodities by the pratīhāra. But the similarity in the form of the three

---

1. In Yazdani, Early History of Deccan, p.414; cf. Gupta, Land System, p.222.
2. I.A., XXX p.267 f.n.2.
3. D.H.N.I., II.1113.
4. p.13.
5. I.A., XIV.103.
6. H.R.S., p.296.
7. Socio-Economic History, p.233.

expressions would suggest that they have a similar meaning and we would agree with U.N.Ghoshal that these refer to the contributions made to these three officers. This is clear from the form akṣapaṭalādāya which we find in another grant of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra dated 1109 A.D.[1] Akṣapaṭala and pratīhāra refer respectively to the officer in charge of records and accounts and the doorkeeper or the head of the palace guards. It is difficult to determine the officer denoted by the term viśatiathū. It has been suggested[2] that he may be the officer in charge of the revenue collection of 28 villages and that the expression viṃśatiochavatha found in another grant of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra dated 1105 A.D.[3] may be a variation of viśatiathūprastha. As regards the actual contribution made to these three officers we would differ from U.N.Ghoshal and take it to be one prastha of the produce from every household.

The Basahi plate of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra[4] also mentions varavajha as a tax but we cannot make out anything about its nature.

Visayadāna is found only in the Candravati inscription of Candradeva.[5] It may be interpreted as some kind of a district

---

1. I.A., XVIII.17.
2. J.B.S.H.O., IV pp.86f.
3. E.I., II.360.
4. I.A., XIV.103.
5. E.I., IX.302.

tax[1], probably paid in connection with a pattalā.[2]

Two other taxes which are also mentioned only in the Candravati inscription are tarādāya and svanaukābhāṭaka. The first refers to ferry dues and the second to the rent paid by fishermen and others for the private use of the royal boats.[3] It is significant that the pattalā granted in this inscription was bounded by rivers on its three sides.[4]

In some of the grants of Jayaccandra[5] we find a tax called yamalikāmbali or yavalikāmbali[6] which is difficult to explain. It has been pointed out by B.N.S.Yadav[7] that yamalikā means a sort of singer and ambali a tax on the analogy of the term unbali or umbali which is used in the Caulukyan inscriptions as a tax surrendered by the state in favour of some person or institution.[8] Thus yamalikāmbali may have been a tax levied on a particular type of singer minstrel.

The Machlishahr grant of Haricandra[9] has a fiscal expression dagapasadīdīrghagovica of which it is difficult to make any

---

1. R.S.Tripathi, History of Kanauj, p.349.
2. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.183.
3. Cf. Artha, II.28.
4. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., pp.186f.
5. Ibid., p.184.
6. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.300. In the Lucknow Museum Plate (E.I., XXIV.293-5) the form is yamalikāmbali.
7. Op.cit., p.290 f.n.3.
8. I.H.Q., XX.287.
9. E.I., X.100.

sense. We wonder if it had anything to do with the branding of cattle.

The Basahi grant of Mahārājaputra Govindacandra[1] mentions ākara also as a tax. It refers to the tax on the output of mines which were allowed to be worked by private individuals.

In the Kamauli inscription dated V.S. 1230[2] nidhinikṣepa is mentioned along with other taxes and dues. It has been explained as a tax on the property held in trust.[3] But generally the term is included in the list of the rights and privileges transferred to the donee and its inclusion among the dues is only a mistake. Likewise the Rahan grant[4] has vāhyāvāhyāntara-siddhi in its list of taxes. But the expression mostly occurs in connection with the boundaries of the village granted and is intended to convey an idea of the fullness of the rights of the donee.[5] It apparently refers to the right of the king to treasure-trove (nidhi) and unclaimed deposits (nikṣepa).

In the land-grants of the Pālas and other contemporary dynasties[6] besides the usual land revenue we have references to

---

1. EI I.A., XIV.101-4.
2. E.I., IV.124.
3. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., pp.171f.
4. I.A., XVIII.17.
5. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.188 splits the first part of the expression into vāhyāvāhyam and tara. But the land-grants from other parts of India also indicate that it is not to be thus split up but rather has to be corrected as vāhyābhyantara.
6. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., pp.243-46.

uparikara (extra cess), dasāparādha (fines realised from villagers for committing the ten offences) and cauroddharana. Cauroddharana has been variously interpreted as the right of extirpation of robbers[1], the special privilege of apprehension of thieves[2], police protection[3] and things recovered from thieves[4]. But in explaining the term we have to emphasise two points, firstly the form (sa-cauroddharana) and position of the term in the records indicate that it refers to an item of income to the king, and secondly in some inscriptions of Assam[5] cauroddharana is included in the list of oppressions from which the donee is exempted. Thus we find that U.N.Ghoshal's[6] suggestion that it was a tax imposed upon villagers for protection against thieves is the best. Choudhury[7] proposes to interpret the term as the money and food to be given to the police officers who might enter the land in connection with the apprehension of thieves. But there would not be much propriety in transferring these provisions to the donee and hence we support the explanation offered by Ghoshal.

Besides these taxes we can infer the existence in the Pāla

---

1. R.D.Banerji in E.I., XIV no. 23.
2. Vogel, Antiquities of the Chamba State, p.129.
3. N.G.Majumdar, Inscriptions of Bengal, III p.8.
4. D.C.Sircar in E.I., XXIX p.5 f.n.3.
5. E.I., XXX.205-9; XXXII.288-92; U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.248.
6. I.H.Q., V.277-9.
7. History of the Civilisation of Assam, p.297.

kingdom of two more, customs and tolls (śulka) and ferry dues (tara) from the reference to the officials śaulkika and tarika in the Pāla grants.[1] A grant of the Sena dynasty[2] refers to the income derived from betel-leaf plantations (barajas) and the price of betel-nuts.[3]

In some of the land-grants from Orissa we find fiscal terms which are not found elsewhere.[4] It has been suggested[5] that hasti-daṇḍa is a tax on the maintenance of elephants, varabalīvarddā is the tax on superior bulls[6], hala-daṇḍa is the tax on ploughs, padātijīvya is subsistence for the infantry, vandāpanā is tribute to the king, vijaya-vandāpanā is the tribute paid after the king obtained a victory and āhi-daṇḍa is a tax on snake-charmers. We may suggest that of the unexplained terms in these inscriptions suvarṇṇadaṇḍa is a tax either on goldsmiths or on gold-washing, vartma-daṇḍa is a road-cess, visayālī is a district tax and khaṇḍapālīya is a tax for the chief of the administrative division called khaṇḍa. There still remain some terms for which we fail to offer any explanation, ciṭṭola, andhāruā, pratyandhāruā, adattā, antarāvaḍḍi, āturāvaḍḍi, rintakāvaḍḍi,

---

1. E.I., XVIII.304-7; XV.295-8.
2. I.B., III no. XV.
3. U.N.Ghoshal, Hindu Revenue System, pp.266f.
4. E.I., XXXIII.266-8; XXVIII.324-6.
5. E.I., XXXIII.264.
6. In the Kelga Plates (E.I., XXVIII.324-6) the reading cara-balīvarda if not a mistake for vara-balīvarda would imply two distinct taxes on the use of pasture and the possession of superior bulls.

vasāvakī, bandhadaṇḍa, tṛṇodakaśāsanārddhika[1], ārthāruā, prtyarthāruā and gogauḍa.

The detailed specimens of Candella land-grants[2] mention along with the usual bhāgabhogakara and hiraṇya, paśu and śulka also as the dues which the villagers were required to pay to the donee. Śulka stands for tolls and paśu may be explained, as has been done by R.K.Dikshit[3], as either a tax on cattle or the right to commandeer the people's bullocks etc., for state service. In some of these Candella records the feudatories (rāja), royal officials (rājapuruṣa), forest officials (āṭavika) and oāṭas are required to transfer their perquisites (ābhāvya) as gifts to donees, which indicates that they had originally been assigned certain rights in the villages.[4] Some Candella grants[5] include the receipts from fines (daṇḍādāya) also in the list of revenues assigned to the donee.

The land-grants of the Kalacuris also contain terms which in some cases cannot be satisfactorily explained.[6] Pravaṇi may

---

1. It may refer to the dues paid to the state for the land granted as a kara-śāsana.
2. E.I., XXXII.121-23; XX.129-31; XVI.12-14.
3. J.U.P.H.S., XXIII.243.
4. It has been suggested by R.S.Sharma, J.E.S.H.O., IV.80f that this development began in the later half of the 12th century under Paramardi. But the expression rāja-rājapuruṣāṭavikacāṭādibhiḥ avaṃ avamābhāvyaṃ parihartṭavyam appears also in the plates of king Madanavarman dated 1136 A.D.-E.I., XXXII. 121-23.
5. I.A., XVI.201ff.
6. C.I.I., IV.324-31, 645-52; E.I., XXI no.15.

be equated with pravaṇikara of the Gāhaḍavāla records but vāḍa is difficult to explain. Hiralal takes pravaṇivāḍa as a single expression meaning the dues for occupying camping grounds but gives no arguments in favour of this interpretation. We would prefer to treat them as separate terms, as in some grants pravaṇi appears by itself and vāḍa follows after three more terms. We can offer no satisfactory interpretation of vāḍa. Carī may be taken to be the tax[3] on grazing cattle. Rasavati has been explained as the liquor tax[3] or the dues for extracting toddy.[4] Hiralal[5] explains kāmata and viseṇimādāya[6] to mean respectively "a rigid form of home-farm" and the dues for crossing rivers. By the first explanation he presumably means the delegation of the right to collect taxes. We see no reason why kāmata should mean this. His interpretation of the second, for which he gives no basis, does not convince us, and we prefer to take these terms as unexplained. Pattakilādāya may easily be taken to stand for the tax payable by the villagers to the village

---

1. E.I., XXI p.93.
2. C.I.I., IV.645-52.
3. Ibid.
4. E.I., XXI p.93.
5. Ibid.
6. Mirashi translates it is as the cess on viseṇimā. On the analogy of the expressions which follow it may be suggested that it was the tax for an officer designated viseṇimā, but the meaning of this term is quite unknown.

headman (paṭṭakila). Duṣṭasādhyādāya which also appears as dussādhyādāya has been left unexplained by U.N.Ghoshal.[1] Hiralal explains it as a tax for "mending the incorrigibles" by which we assume he means the reform of hardened criminals. Mirashi takes it to be a tax for dussādhyas whom he explains as criminals and other suspects living within the limits of the village. But it has not been noted that in these Kalacuri records themselves duṣṭasādhya appears as the designation of an officer who seems to have been incharge of criminals administration. Duṣṭasādhyāya may therefore be explained as the dues realised for paying this officer. Ardhapuruṣārikādāya is difficult to explain. It may refer to the dues collected for the officer designated ardhapuruṣārikā but we cannot suggest any explanation of this title. Viṣayikādāya may be explained as the district dues. Ghaṭṭādāya refers to dues paid at the fords. In place of the term danda of these grants, we find the compound daṇḍādāyakarotpatti in other records of the same dynasty[2] which has to be translated to mean the income from taxes and the receipts from fines. Mārgapaka of these records is to be found elsewhere also. A.K.Majumdar[3] proposes without extending any

---

1. H.R.S., p.254 f.n.2.
2. E.I., II no.23.
3. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.250.

reasons in his support to take it to mean the forced labour which Manu[1] permitted the king to exact from mechanics, artisans and sudras one day in each month. In a grant of the Somavaṁśī king Karṇa[2] mārggaṇī seems to have been used in the general sense of petty dues. But mārgaṇaka in these records is used as the name of a specific tax. Mārggaṇa means a request and hence the term may refer to a benevolence.[3] It was possibly an emergency tax in the form of theoretically voluntary gifts.

A Paramāra grant from Mandhata[4] belonging to the last quarter of the thirteenth century, besides mentioning the usual dues hiraṇya, bhāgabhoga, uparikara and daṇḍa, refers to certain taxes ~~xxx~~ which were probably paid in kind. These are : śāka-muṣṭi (handfuls of vegetables), tailapalikā (small measures of oil) and kumbhapūraka (vesselfuls most probably of grain). These terms are followed by ākāśotpatti and pātāla. U.N.Ghoshal[5] notes ākāśotpatti in a few land-grants of the feudatories of the Cedi and Candella kings and relying on its literal meaning "the produce of the sky" identifies it with the bhūtavāta of the older inscriptions. But the form of the term to be equated with ākāśotpatti would have been vātabhūta and not bhūtavāta. In the Kuretha (Gwalior) grant of the Pratihāra king Malayavarman[6] the

---

1. VII.138.
2. E.I., XXXIII.266-68.
3. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.237.
4. E.I., XXXII.148-56.
5. H.R.S., pp.254f.
6. E.I., XXX.148-50.

village granted was accompanied with the produce of the sky and the under-world (ākāśapātālotpattisahitam). This would suggest that all these expressions are to be equated with ākāśapātāla which is mentioned in some Gāhaḍavāla records[1] not in connection with the enumeration of dues and income but with the rights and privileges transferred to the donee. Ākāśa may be taken to refer to what is acquired only accidentally and pātāla to what is inside the earth.[2] But it is to be noted that in some of the records having these expressions we have a separate reference to nidhi and nikṣepa and mines.[3] We would suggest that these expressions have been mentioned only to convey the sense of the fullness of the rights of the donees over the land or village granted.

Kalyāṇadhana which also appears in some of the grants of the feudatories of the Cedi and Candella kings have been left unexplained by U.N.Ghoshal.[4] We may suggest that it stands for the dues collected on auspicious occasions. It may be equated with maṅgalyadaṇḍa mentioned in the Rājataraṅginī.[5]

D.Sharma[6] has collected the fiscal terms occurring in the

---

1. R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.188.
2. We wonder if these terms were put to cover the existing superstitions which viewed certain objects as not produced on the earth but falling from the sky or the nether world.
3. E.I., XXXII.148-56; R.Niyogi, Op.cit., p.188.
4. H.R.S., pp.254f.
5. VIII.565-68.
6. Early Chauhān Dynasties, pp.207-11.

records of the Cāhamāna empire. Talārābhāvya[1], selahathābhāvya and balādhipābhāvya refer to the share respectively of officers called talāra, selahatha (śalyahasta) and balādhipa in the revenue collected at the custom's house. Dāna is used in the sense of customs tax. Ādāna may be the full form of dāna or is a general term for dues. Lāga is generally contrasted with bhāga and may refer to imposts. In the Nadlai inscription of Rājyapāla[2] ātmapāilā refers to the pāilā measure of articles for the bhoktā or jagirdar who appears as the donor of the grant. Halasadi is a tax calculated per plough. Daśabandha, as we have seen[3], is a tax amounting to one-tenth of the income. Rājakīyabhoga stands for the shorter and more common term, bhoga. Besides these we find references to udraṅga, uparikara and daṇḍa also.

In the Rajor grant of the Pratihāra chief Mathanadeva[4] we have, besides udraṅga, bhoga, bhāga, daṇḍadaśāparādha and dāna, many new taxes. Mayūṭa is difficult to explain. U.N.Ghoshal[5] suggests that it is probably a contribution of the type of bhoga. Khalabhikṣā appears elsewhere also[6], sometimes as khalaka[7].

---

1. (Bhavnagar) Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, p.158 translates it as "revenue of a talāra area".
2. E.I., XI p.37.
3. See supra pp. 105-6.
4. E.I., III.266-7.
5. H.R.S., p.237.
6. E.I., XXV.280f.
7. I.A., XVIII.114, l.55.

Literally it means begging at a threshing floor[1], and has been taken to stand for the demand for a portion of the crop, over and above the usual grain-share that was collected from the grain heaped upon the threshing floor.[2] The Karitalai inscription of Lakṣmaṇarāja II[3] records the donation of four khalabhikṣās. It may be suggested that the state enjoyed the monopoly of threshing floors to which the cultivators had to bring their corn for threshing. The term may refer to a tax in kind which was paid to the state when the corn was threshed. U.N. Ghoshal[4] proposes to treat prasthaka as the contribution at a specific rate for every prastha measure of liquid. But we suggest, on the analogy of akṣapaṭalaprastha and similar other terms in the Gāhaḍavāla records, that it refers to a contribution at the rate of a prastha from every household. We have explained mārggaṇaka elsewhere.[5] A.S.Altekar[6] suggests that skandhaka refers to the liability of labourers to carry the luggage of the touring officers upon their shoulders. But as

---

1. The Deśīnāmamālā, VII.89 explains vippayaṃ as khalabhikṣā which suggests that the literal meaning of the term khalabhikṣā was its original use and it was on the analogy of the alms given in the threshing floor that the due was called.
2. U.N.Ghoshal, Op. cit., p.237.
3. E.I., II.174ff.
4. Loc. cit.
5. See supra pp. 114-5.
6. State and Government in Ancient India, p.281, f.n.5.

it is mentioned under the dues received by the king (pratyādāya) we feel that U.N.Ghoshal's[1] suggestion that it is a contribution at specific rate for every ~~xxxx~~ shoulder-load of articles is a better one. Aputtrikādhana which means the property of one who in the absence of sons has not appointed his daughter to raise male issue for himself has justly been interpreted as the right of the king to the property of a person dying sonless.[2] U.N.Ghoshal[3] does not say anything about the term nagṭibharaṭa. We wonder if it refers to something like a death duty which the widow, with no son to inherit the property, paid before being awarded the necessary permission to own the property.[4] A land-grant of Mahendrapāla from Malwa[5] mentions besides the usual royal dues ākandhaka and mārggaṇaka. Two land-grants of the feudatories of Mahendrapāla from Kathiawar[6] include the term collaka in their list of royal dues. We may interpret the term in the light of the Rajor inscription[7] which mentions the toll of 50 leaves on every collikā (probably a measure of load) brought from outside. Collaka may therefore be taken as the

---

1. H.R.S., p.237.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. The Mitākṣarā on Yāj., II.135-36 gives a sonless widow the right to succeed on the sole condition of her chastity.
5. E.I., XIV no.13 (Part II).
6. E.I., IX no.1 (A and B).
7. E.I., III.266-67.

contribution of one collaka of certain commodities. One of these inscriptions from Kathiawar describes the grant as accompanied with the right of utpadyamānaviṣṭi.[1] U.N.Ghoshal[2] translates it as the forced labour as it falls due. Hirashi[3] takes it to mean "forced labour arising therefrom" (i.e., from the transfer of the land to the donee). R.S.Sharma[4] has suggested that the expression refers to the right to impose forced labour as occasion might arise, which suggests that the donees could determine these occasions at their discretion. This may be supported on the ground that though according to the legal texts the amount of forced labour which a king could exact was fixed, the actual practice in the days before the abolition of zamindari was that the landlord could demand it as and when he needed it. But we must note that the expression appears in the list of taxes transferred to the donee, often specifically implied in the form of the expression as utpadyamānaviṣṭipratyāya. Thus D.C.Sircar[5] seems to be nearer to the form of the expression when he translates it as the tax payable in lieu of free labour. We would substitute 'free' by 'forced' and suggest that it refers

---

1. E.I., IX no.1 (B).
2. H.R.S., p.238.
3. C.I.I., IV p.89.
4. J.E.S.H.O., I.319.
5. E.I., XXXII.48.

to the dues paid by the villagers in place of the forced labour they had to perform for the state. In Kashmir the system of forced labour appears as rūḍhabhārodhi. The Rājataraṅgiṇī suggests that it was not always necessarily the actual carriage of loads but may be commuted by some payment in cash or kind. King Saṅkaravarman is said to have introduced this system of forced labour. He fined the villagers failing to carry loads for one year, at the value of the load calculated according to the highest prices in the regions concerned.[1] In the reign of Harṣa a certain temple was plundered, hence the members of the purohita corporation requested him for being exempted from rūḍhibhārodhi (forced labour).[2] This reference also favours the suggestion that the forced labour was often commuted in the form of cash or kind payment.

In the grants of the Caulukyas of Gujarat we have besides the usual terms dāṇibhāga or dāṇibhogabhāga, navanidhāna and abhinavamārggaṇaka.[3] U.N.Ghoshal[4] explains dāṇibhāga as the periodical supplies of fruits, firewood and the like by the villagers. But in the Lekhapaddhati[5] dāṇi has been used as mean-

---

1. Rāj., V.172ff.
2. Rāj., VII.1088. Also ibid., VIII.2513.
3. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.256.
4. Ibid.
5. pp. 7, 16, 18f.

ing land-tax and we think the Caulukya records employ the term in the same sense. U.N.Ghoshal[1] explains navanidhāna as a kind of cess upon agricultural land imposed for the first time at the date of the grant, but observes in the case of abhinava-mārggaṇaka that the original imposition of this kind had become permanent, and that an additional levy was made at this time. D.Sharma[2] on the basis of the Bamnera grant of Kelhaṇadeva[3] suggests that nidhāna refers to articles like treasure-trove. In the Rajor inscription[4] also nidhi and nidhāna have been used together. Navanidhāna appears not only in epigraphic records but also in the Lekhapaddhati[5]. It is likely taht nava stands for 'nine' and not 'new' on the analogy of the common fiscal term aṣṭabhoga.

In the inscriptions of the Gujarat branch of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas[6] bhūtavātapratyāya is mentioned as one of the items of income. U.N.Ghoshal[7] could not findx the precise meaning of the term and only translated it literally as the revenue derived from the elements and the winds. Recently S.K.Maity[8] has suggested to take

---

1. Op. cit., pp. 256, 295.
2. Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.210.
3. E.I., XIII.210.
4. E.I., III no.36.
5. p.6.
6. U.N.Ghoshal, H.R.S., p.240.
7. Ibid., pp.215, 217.
8. Economic Life in the Gupta period, p.63.

the term as denoting two different kinds of cess for the maintenance of rites respectively for the winds (vāta) and for the spirits (bhūta). The explanation is quite likely for the form bhūtavāta which no doubt is the most usual one. But we have to note the forms sambhṛtopāttapratyāya and bhūtopāttapratyāya found in some records. These favour the suggestion of A.S.Altekar[1] that the expression stands for a tax on what has been produced in the village (bhūta) and what has been imported (upātta). This suggestion receives support from the Siroda (Goa) Plates of Devarāja[2] which use words which make the meaning of the expressions in question clear. It speaks of the grant being accompanied by the income accruing from the output of the village and also the income realised from things brought (parivṛttena cānītena yanniṣpadyate). It is quite likely that āvāta or vāta was the Sanskritised form of the Prakrit equivalent for upātta. We have elsewhere pointed out[3] that in the Khoh Plates of Jayanātha[4] and Śarvanātha[5] āvātāya and śulka have been used as if they were interchangeable. So we can treat Altekar's suggestion as the best explanation in the present state of our knowledge.

---

1. Rāshṭrakūṭas and their times, pp.228ff.
2. E.I., XXIV.145.
3. J.I.H., XXXVIII.589.
4. C.I.I., III no.27.
5. Ibid., no.31.

CHAPTER IV - SLAVERY

In respect of the position of slaves the early medieval period has to be regarded as an age of decline. We find a definite deterioration in the standard of values, a worsening of the plight of the slaves and an increase in the number of slaves. The legal works of the period, concerned mainly with the explanation of the earlier texts, do not reflect the real condition of the age and an exclusive reliance on them may give a wrong impression about slavery in the period.[1]

The frequent feudal wars and raids must have resulted in the enslavement of the people of the country defeated or attacked. The practice of enslaving prisoners no doubt goes back to an early period[2], but in our period the attacks by feudal chiefs on neighbouring areas were often motivated by the desire not for territorial gain but for loot, even in the form of slaves. Medhātithi observes that 'the captive of war' mentioned by Manu (VIII.415) does not refer to the kṣatriya made captive in war but to the slave who after the defeat of his owner is brought over and enslaved by the captor. It may follow from this that a war brought to the victor not only slaves previously owned by

---

1. Cf. G.H.Ojha, Madhyakālīna Bhāratīya Samskrti, pp. 48-50.
2. Mbh., IV.33.59-60; III.256.11; Jātakas, III.147; IV.220; V.497; VI.220.

the vanquished but also captives. It appears that in some cases the feudal raids were accompanied by the abduction or enslavement of the people in the country attacked. The girls said in the documents of the Lekhapaddhati[1] to have been brought from raids on other countries and sold into slavery most likely belonged to this category. The very fact that out of the four documents on slavery the Lekhapaddhati devotes two to this type indicates how widely prevalent it was. In one document a certain Rāṇā Śrī Pratāpasiṁha is said to have brought the girl in question from an attack made on a foreign state.[2] In the second document a certain rājaputra is said to have captured the girl when fighting in the service of Mahāmaṇḍaleśvara Rāṇaka Śrī Vīradhavaladeva in his attack on Mahārāṣṭra.[3] It would appear that on the second occasion very many people were sold into slavery. The document does not record proper names of the buyers and sellers but uses the expression ā 'so and so' implying that several general drafts were made so that the names of the buyers and sellers could be entered when the sale was finalised.

The deterioration in the general economic condition of the masses was another factor responsible for the increase in the

---

1. pp. 44f.
2. p. 44.
3. pp. 44f.

number of slaves. Indebtedness often led people to sell themselves as slaves. Thus Medhātithi[1], concerned at the practice, probably quite prevalent in his time in some places, of the debtor being made to repay the debt by selling himself, observes that it is an instance of local and king-made laws which are contrary to the Smṛti and therefore are not to be obeyed. One of the documents in the Lekhapaddhati concerns a destitute girl selling herself as a slave.[2] Here also we do not have personal names of the slave and the purchaser suggesting its very frequent use. During famines, which were not rare in the period, people accepted slavery to maintain their lives. Besides natural calamities feudal plundering would also have reduced people to dire straits. The depredations of the Muslims would have further contributed to the economic exhaustion of the masses. All these factors working for the increase in the number of the slaves appear to have been recognised in a Lekhapaddhati document which describes how as a result of a Muslim invasion and plunder a famine visited a village and it was abandoned; a girl unable to support herself from begging had to request people to accept her as a slave.[3]

A regular trade in slaves seems to have existed in this

---

1. On Manu VIII.46.
2. p. 47.
3. pp. 45-47.

period. We often read in the stories of villages of robbers, who used to capture people and sell them into slavery. The forest tribes are often described as indulging in such activities.[1] In the Upamitibhavaprapañcakathā we have an interesting reference to robbers feeding a man so that he might be sold for a handsome price.[2] It would appear from the stories of the period that there was a regular export of slaves to Persia.[3] The Prabandha-cintāmaṇi states that Tejapāla, the minister of Vīradhavala, earned merit by banning the abduction of men by seamen.[4] We can legitimately doubt the complete success of this measure, but what is significant is the suggestion that the number of slaves exported from Gujarat had been such as to create a serious problem for the sincere Jain minister. Significantly enough in the above-mentioned story in the Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[5] also the robbers happily think of the high price that their slave would fetch in a foreign country (parakūle). A document in the Lekhapaddhati[6] also refers to slaves being shipped to overseas and sold or exchanged for other commodities. It would appear that even some kings participated in the slave trade. Thus according to the Rājataraṅgiṇī[7] king Vajrāditya of Kashmir sold

---

1. E.g., Samarāiccakahā, II pp. 91f.
2. pp. 404-5.
3. Cf. Kathākosa, p. 157; Samarāiccakahā, p. 342.
4. p. 99 l. 20.
5. pp. 404f.
6. p. 47.
7. IV.39.

many men as slaves to the Mlecchas.

The institution of slavery was by now thoroughly conventionalised. This is suggested by the fact that we have set forms for recording the sale of slaves in the Lekhapaddhati. As we shall see later[1], these forms detail the duties of a slave girl even when she was meant to serve rather as a concubine than as a menial.

But in spite of the growth in the volume of slave trade we do not find any reference to regular slave-markets. In one of the documents in the Lekhapaddhati[2] we find the girl being made to stand at the catuṣpatha[3] and then sold. In another document also when the girl is said to have asked a man to keep her as a slave he accepted her request at the catuṣpatha.[4] Thus it seems likely that the catuṣpatha served as the regular place for the sale of slaves, and was chosen so that the sale might be made known to everybody in the city.

The most remarkable change in the period would appear to have been a definite decline in human values. From the Lekhapaddhati[5] we learn of a rājaputra girl falling at the feet of a merchant and begging to be kept as a slave. It is stated that at the catuṣpatha of the city and with the knowledge of

---

1. See infra p. 137.
2. p. 44.
3. A place where four roads meet and hence the central most area of the city.
4. pp. 45-7.
5. Ibid.

the people of all the four castes he accepted her as a slave girl. This clearly indicates a change for the worse when compared with the humane attitude of Kauṭilya[1] who declared that an Ārya was not to be reduced to slavery. The case recorded is also in violent opposition to the earlier rule in the Smṛti texts which disallows a man reducing to slavery people belonging to castes higher than his own.[2] This decline is noticed also in regard to the duties performed by slaves. As we shall see according to the Lekhapaddhati a slave girl was required to throw away night soil.[3] Earlier rules as found in the Arthaśāstra[4] lay down that causing a slave to remove dead bodies, ordure, urine or leavings of food, hurting or abusing him and employing a female to attend on the master while he was bathing naked involved the forfeiture of the price paid for the slave.

The condition of a slave was bad. As in earlier periods the expression son or daughter of a slave girl is used to imply utter contempt.[5] People in general do not seem to have felt any sympathy for the miseries of a slave. In the Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda[6] we have a sarcastic reference to the fake weeping of a slave

---

1. Artha III.13.
2. Yāj., II.183; Nārada, V.39; Kātyāyana, 716; Viṣṇu q. in Parāśaramādhavīya, p. 154.
3. p. 44.
4. III.13.
5. Karpūramañjarī, pp. 22, 31, 156; Samayamātṛkā, VIII.18.
6. Caturbhāṇi, II p.2.

girl which is born out of nothingness and is difficult to cure. The usual picture of a slave girl was of drooping limbs fatigued with doing all the work.[1] From the Lekhapaddhati[2] too we learn that a slave was expected "to work hard, zealously and tirelessly by day and night, in rains, heat and cold without caring for hunger or thirst". Torture and beating were the usual fate of a slave. The Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita[3], referring to the normal treatment of slaves, says that they are beaten like mules, bear very heavy loads, endure thirst etc. In the Lekhapaddhati[4] the owner of a slave girl is empowered, in the case of her running away, stealing or spreading any rumour about him, to knock her down, drag her by her hair, bind her, beat her, and set her again to work as a slave. In one document we read that if she did not obey his orders the owner could kick her and beat her with sticks even to the extent of killing her without incurring any guilt.[5] We can imagine the cruel beatings which the slave received from the fact that these documents contain a clause to the effect that if after being beaten a slave girl commits suicide by jumping into a well she will be

---

1. Kavīndravacanasamuccaya, v. 505.
2. pp. 45-47.
3. Ip. 56.
4. pp. 44-47.
5. pp. 45-47.

reborn as a she-ass, bitch or a cāṇḍālī, and the owner will be absolved of guilt merely by bathing in the Gaṅgā.[1] It would appear from one document that beating was not the only reason for the slaves committing suicide. Their general condition was so bad as to give frequent occasions for their attempting suicide.[2]

It is really significant that the Lekhapaddhati, though detailing the duties of a slave and the powers of the owner, makes no provision to safeguard the rights or needs of a slave. The documents require the slave girl to serve the owner till her death. In one case the purchaser is called janma-grāhaka thereby referring to his rights over the life of the slave.[3] There is nothing in the documents to suggest that the slave could ever or in any manner regain his freedom. On the other hand we have a definite statement that no relation of the slave girl could possibly interrupt her work as a slave by reclaiming her.[4]

The legal works of the period make it quite clear that a slave was entitled to nothing but to bare maintenance.[5] Medhātithi[6] also implies that a slave is merely to be fed and clothed

---

1. pp. 44-45.
2. pp. 45-47.
3. p. 47.
4. pp. 44-45.
5. Cf. Vyavahāramayūkha, p. 114.
6. On Manu IX.143.

A Lekhapaddhati document stipulates that a slave girl is to be paid by her owner according to his capacity only with food, clothing and foot-wear and adds that she will want nothing more.[1] From another document we learn that the highest which a slave faithful to his duties could expect was to receive, without having to ask for it, food, clothing and the like according to the customs, country and times and also the capacity of the owner.[2]

The sons of slave girls would appear to have been a burden on society, wasting their energies in unsocial activities. Thus it appears from Haribhadra's commentary on the Daśavaikālika-sūtra[3] that a slave girl's son had only a thread-bare garment and was a rogue who would for the sake of stakes in gambling burgle a house, kill the residents by kicking them, and then visit a prostitute and drink wine and eat fish.

All this makes dismal reading and indicates what a wretched life a slave had to lead. Rāhula Sāṁkṛtyāyana[4] goes to the extent of suggesting that slaves in the period were treated as sub-human beings. But such a view arises from a lop-sided emphasis on the dark aspects of the picture. The slave was

---

1. pp. 45-7.
2. p. 44.
3. p. 54.
4. Hindi Kāvya Dhārā, Introduction, pp. 17f.

after all a part of the household and it is easy to imagine that the constant association could not but have created in the more humane owner some consideration. Actually the condition of a slave largely depended upon the master. From the Tilotha image inscription[1] we know of five female slaves who accompanied their master Nāyaka Pratāpadhavala on a pilgrimage. The fact that the master had the names of the female slaves recorded at the foot of the image indicates that they were not regarded as nonentities or sub-human beings, but received kind consideration.

It is also to be realised that idealist thinkers who felt genuine sympathy with the miserable condition of the slaves were not wanting. Thus we find Medhātithi trying to minimise the rigours of the rules in Manu by offering a liberal interpretation. In commenting upon the statement that the wife, the son and the slave have no property and whatever they acquire is the property of him to whom they belong, Medhātithi[2] takes cognisance of the fact that as a matter of fact slaves also have proprietary rights over their property, and observes that what is meant by the text is only that the slave and others are dependent and subservient and without the master's sanction cannot employ their wealth as they choose. Likewise he explains

---

1. E.I., XX.249.
2. On Manu VIII.416.

Manu's[1] precept that an erring slave, wife or son should be beaten with a rope or a split bamboo, as enjoining a method of correcting them and not as ordering an actual beating in every case. He adds that verbal chastisement should be applied to correct them, beating being resorted to only when the fault is serious. The Mānasollāsa[2] includes slaves under the head of servants (bhṛtya) and observes that one who aims at his good in this life and the next should protect, feed and nourish his servants and also bestow gifts and honours on them.

There is nothing to show that slaves were exclusively used for economic enterprises or that the economic life of the times depended upon them. It appears that the slaves were essentially domestic servants and had to perform diverse household tasks including those in the fields. This is clear from the fact that the lexicons do not maintain any difference between a slave and a servant.[3] Bhaṭṭotpala[4] also explains dāsa (slave) as meaning karmakāra (labourer). We have already mentioned how the Mānasollāsa[5] includes wage-earners, slaves, labourers and others under the general name of servants (bhṛtya). Even in Medhātithi[6] we read that the bath-attendant, the toilet-man (prasādhaka), the cook and so forth who are employed for performing definite

---

1. VIII.299.
2. I p. 28 vv. 303-4.
3. Cf. Vaijayantī, p.136 ll.3-5; ibid., p.175 l.51; Abhidhāna-ratnamālā, vv. 365, 492.
4. On Bṛhatsaṁhitā, CIII.41.
5. I p. 28 vv. 303-4.
6. On Manu IX.143.

tasks are dāsas. This is however not to imply that there was no difference between a servant and a slave. Medhātithi[1] recognises the difference between serving (paricaryā) and slavery (dāsyam) and observes that slavery consists in doing base (nikṛṣṭa) work and in not objecting to going anywhere while serving may consist in shampooing the body, guarding the family or property and so forth. Aparārka[2] and Devaṇṇabhaṭa[3] quote Kātyāyana, who makes a clear distinction between a slave and a hired servant.

The duties of a slave girl as enumerated in the Triṣaṣṭi-śalākāpuruṣacarita[4] were threshing, grinding, carrying water, sweeping the house, smearing the house with cow-dung and the like. In the Lekhapaddhati we get detailed enumerations of the tasks done by a slave girl. Thus she had to cut (vegetables), pulverise (the spices), smear the floor (with cow-dung), sweep, bring fuel and water, throw away night soil (of the master's family)[5], milk the cow, the buffalo and the goat, churn the curd and carry whey to the field and threshing-floor and do field-work such as bringing fodder and weeding and cutting

---

1. On Manu VIII.415.
2. p. 788.
3. Smṛticandrikā, II.197.
4. III p. 248.
5. It may incidentally be pointed out that there was no feeling of ritual impurity to these slaves throwing away night soil as may be gathered from their being employed for cooking.

grass and the like.[1] In the second document cooking is added to the list and the duties connected with the threshing-floor are mentioned along with those of the field.[2] The new duties found in a third document are ploughing, washing the hands and feet (of the master), cleaning the gutters (khāla) and reservoirs of water (kuṇḍika), tending the cattle and going to far and near places.[3] In these documents we find work connected with cultivation and cattle-rearing included in the list of the duties of a slave girl. But there is no indication of her being employed exclusively in these tasks, or of these economic activities being performed on any remarkable scale by slaves. All these duties form the necessary functions of a household in a predominantly agricultural society. But in at least one of the documents there is a provision that on the orders of her owner the slave girl should perform all these tasks in another house or family.[4] This may suggest that some slave-owners at times made their slaves serve elsewhere, in some cases possibly to earn money. But it does not seem likely from the reference that there was any noticeable economic use or exploitation of the slaves in such a manner.

---

1. p. 44.
2. pp. 44-5.
3. p. 47.
4. Ibid.

Slave girls have been used as concubines since very early times.[1] In our period this practice would appear to have been quite common. Thus according to the commentator Maheśvara the practice of keeping female slaves mentioned in the Dāyabhāga[2] refers to women kept for enjoyment. Medhātithi[3] also speaks of slave girls who are kept for pleasure and receive food and clothing. The Mitākṣarā[4] also explains slave girls of the avaruddhā and bhujiṣyā types in terms of their use for sexual enjoyment. From the Lekhapaddhati also we can demonstrate that slave girls were often kept rather for sexual pleasure than for their utility as maid servants. The list of duties have to be included in a conventional form of slave-deed. But it would appear that they had not necessarily to perform these duties. The documents often emphasise the form, complexion and young age of the slave girls. Thus we find reference to their being of white-complexion, sixteen years old and with pleasing and auspicious limbs.[5] In one document the slave girl is described as having black eyes, a sharp nose, and long hair, being neither too high nor too short and with all her limbs in proper form.[6]

---

1. Artha, III.13; Kātyāyana, 728; Jātakas, I.225, 451f; III. 409, 444; VI.110, 117, 285.
2. p. 149.
3. On Manu IX.143.
4. On Yāj., II.290.
5. pp. 44-45.
6. p. 47.

Finally we may note the influence of the Muslims on the condition of slavery in India. We have already seen how the Muslim invasions often created famine conditions which forced people to accept slavery. It has also to be noted that the Muslim invaders often reduced the defeated and captured people to slavery. Thus we have the testimony of Al-'Utbī that after Maḥmūd's victory over Nidar Bhim slaves were so plentiful that they became very cheap.[1] As a result of the Muslim victory in Gujarat in 1197 more than twenty thousand slaves are said to have fallen into the hands of the victors.[2] Likewise we learn of fifty thousand men coming under the collar of slavery after the capture of the fortx of Kalinjar.[3] But in the long run Muslim influence would have been for the betterment of the conditions of slave. Islam with its ideal of universal brotherhood does not attach much stigma to slaves. On the other hand we definitely see that it was a matter of honour to be the slave of an important man. We can see the working of the Islamic attitude in the fact that some of the slaves in Muslim states rose to the highest posts including even kingship.

---

1. Elliot and Dowson, II.39.
2. Ibid., 230.
3. Ibid., 231.

CHAPTER V - GUILDS

In the early medieval period the guilds, which had played an important role in the industrial organisation of the early centuries of the Christian era, were no longer very effective. The bonds which united the craftsmen or artisans of any particular industry in any area appear to have slackened. The guilds would seem in general not to be in a position to wield effective control over their members. This becomes clear from Medhātithi[1] who distinguishes between śreṇī and gaṇa and observes that though the members of the former follow the same profession they can act singly also, whereas the gaṇas always act collectively.

We have seen elsewhere that, unlike earlier times, we do not find many references in this period to guilds receiving permanent endowments and paying periodical interest on them.[2] It may be inferred that the guilds did not seem to the people of those times to be lasting bodies. It is also likely that their prestige and prosperity had also suffered much as a result of weak organisation.

We are not sure what led to this change in the position of the guilds. However, the instability and chaos resulting from

---

1. On Manu VIII.2.
2. See infra p.275.

feudal wars, which did not encourage craftsman to settle down or to form lasting groups, must have been one of the important reasons for this. Moreover the guilds had to face strong competitors in the form of temples who could obviously be regarded as safer bodies for the purposes of managing permanent deposits. The vicissitudes of trade probably served as a contributory factor. Thus in a slightly earlier period the changes in the fortunes of the trade with Rome vitally affected the guild of silk-weavers in Gujarat who had to move away into the interior of the country.[1] The growth of feudalism with its emphasis on a rural and self-sufficient economy can also be expected to have had an adverse impact upon the fortunes of the guilds.

It appears from Medhātithi[2] that there was a tendency in the period for the members of the guilds to refer their disputes to the king. The guilds did not like this because, as Medhātithi says, it gave the king's officers an opportunity to interfere in their work. It would follow from Medhātithi that the hold of the guilds over their members was becoming loose and they could not effectively carry out their decisions against members. Medhātithi adds that hence they always take from the parties concerned sureties against their deviating from the decision

---

1. S.K.Maity, Economic Life in the Gupta period, p.138.
2. On Manu VIII.2.

arrived at, before they proceed to investigate a dispute, the understanding with the surety being that if the party deviates from the decision arrived at by the guild, he shall pay a stipulated fine, or he should compel him to abide by it.

The guilds by this period appear to have become mostly fossilised into occupational sub-castes which no doubt retained some form of corporate life with some social control over the members. Economic co-operation, which in the earlier period had brought the guilds money, power and prestige, was in most cases negligible. This is clearly recognised by some of the works of the period which frankly explain śreṇis in terms of caste. The Mitākṣarā[1] still clinging to the occupational origin of a śreṇi explains it as a group of people of different castes, who subsist by the occupation of one caste like the haḍābukas (horse-dealers), tāmbūlikas (betel-sellers), kuvindas (weavers) and carmakāras (shoe-makers). Then Smṛticandrikā[2] and the Vīramitrodaya[3] clearly admit the change and explain śreṇī as meaning the eighteen low castes such as the rajaka (washerman). The transformation of guilds into sub-castes would appear to have gone much ahead even by the time of Bhaṭṭotpala[4] who, igno-

---

1. On Yāj., II.30.
2. III (Vyavahārakāṇḍa), part 1, p.40.
3. Vyavahāra, p.12.
4. On Bṛhatsaṃhitā, XXXIV.19 - Bahūnāṃ samānajātīyānāṃ saṅghaḥ śreṇī.

ring the professional basis of the guilds, explains them simply as the corporation of many people belonging to the same caste. The Vaijayantī[1] also takes śreṇī as the term for a body of people belonging to the same caste and profession. In the Kānhaḍade-prabandha[2] we have a reference to eighteen varṇas, besides the four high castes, which establishes clearly the transformation of guilds into sub-castes.

In the Abhidhānacintāmaṇi[3] śreṇī and prakṛti appear as synonymous terms. This usage receives support from the fact that Pitāmaha[4], as quoted by the legal works of the period, gives the number of the prakṛtis as eighteen, which we know is also the traditional number of śreṇīs in the Buddhist and Jain texts. References to eighteen prakṛtis are found in the inscriptions of the period also.[5] It has to be noted that Pitāmaha describes the prakṛtis as outside the pale of the four varṇas and āśramas. This may account for the low position of the guilds in this period. The guilds were assigned a social status equal to that of the low castes and sometimes even to that of the outcastes. Thus we find that the Kathākośaprakaraṇa[6] of Jineśvara Sūri men-

---

1. p.237 l.179 - Sajātiśilpasaṃhatyāmaṇḍaḥ śreṇiḥ.
2. I.238 q. by D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.252.
3. III v.714 - Prakṛtayaḥ paurāṇāṃ śreṇayo'pi ca.
4. Smṛticandrikā, II p.29; Parāśaramādhavīya, III p.46. See also Sarasvatīvilāsa, p.74.
5. E.I., II p.220; Proc.Beng.A.S., 1877, p.73; Vogel, Antiquities of Chamba State, pp. 162 (l.11), 166 (l.10), 193 (l.15). See also Skandapurāṇa q. by D.Sharma, loc. cit.
6. Introduction, pp. 116f.

tions the members of x śreṇīs such as the goldsmith, potter, blacksmith and the washerman and other craftsmen and artisans (śilpa-karma-kara-samudāya) as forming the adhama (degraded) class of society. It was the association with the low castes and groups that brought down the guilds in general to a low rung of the social ladder. It should be noticed that in the Jain list[1] some of the guilds are those of aboriginal people and some are of base occupations, especially from the point of view of the ahimsā ideal. The text itself indicates this when it divides the eighteen guilds into two groups, the nāruā (nārukāḥ) being touchables and the kāruā (kārukāḥ) untouchables. But the fact of the guilds being bracketed with the low sub-castes or groups could not by itself have been sufficient to bring them down in social ranking. It is obvious that there had already appeared a corresponding decline in their economic position.

It appears that the guilds had only a local character concerned only with the men of a certain profession in a particular area. They do not seem to have had any organisational connection with their counterparts elsewhere. It can be demonstrated from Medhātithi that the industrial or occupational guilds did not cover wide areas. Thus he defines śreṇī as a

---

1. Jambūdīpa , 43 p.193.

body of traders and others who follow the same profession[1] and illustrates by mentioning tradesmen, artisans, money-lenders, coach-drivers and so forth.[2] Elsewhere he defines saṅgha as a community of persons following the same pursuit, though belonging to different castes and regions (deśa), and by way of illustration mentions the saṅghas of mendicants, of vaṇiks (merchants) and ~~kkm~~ of those versed in the four Vedas.[3] It is significant that artisans or other professions are not mentioned in connection with the saṅghas suggesting thereby that associations of these people covering several districts were not fashionable in the time of Medhātithi. In the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita[4] we read of śreṇīs and praśreṇīs. But praśreṇīs should not be taken to stand for the branches of a central guild distributed in the constituent districts. They may refer to the sub-groups into which any particular guild or occupation was divided on the basis of division of labour. In the Gwalior inscription[5] are recorded two perpetual endowments made respectively by the members of the guild of oil-millers headed by their chiefs (mahattakas) whose names are given and who dwelt in Śrīsarveś-

---

1. On Manu VIII.2.
2. Ibid. 41.
3. Ibid. 219.
4. I p.258.
5. E.I., I.159f ll.11-20.

varapura and the members of the guild of gardeners with their seven chiefs (maharа) who dwelt on the top of Śrī-Gopagiri. The use of the singular number indicates that in both the cases there was only one guild of the occupations in the localities mentioned. It is likely that the persons named as chiefs occupied an important place in their guilds through their being better off than others. However the possibility cannot be ruled out that there were sub-groups like the praśreṇīs of the Jain text in different wards of the city and the chiefs were their heads. From epigraphic references also it appears that the guilds of any one area regulated their affairs without any reference to their counterparts in other districts or to any central body, if it existed at all.[1] The expression Vārendraka-śilpi-goṣṭhī-cūḍāmaṇi used for Rāṇaka Śūlapāṇi in the Deopara inscription[2] has often been taken to mean that he was the head of the guild of the artisans of Varendra (North Bengal).[3] We very much doubt if there was one such guild for all the artisans in Varendra. The use of the term cūḍāmaṇi (crest-jewel) and not the specific name of the office indicates that it is only a stylistic way of expressing his artistic excellence. Thus the term goṣṭhī here does not stand

---

1. Cf. B.N.Puri, History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras, p.129.
2. E.I., I.307ff, v.36.
3. B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p.211.

in the technical sense of a guild or corporate body but refers to assemblage or collection.

As we have seen, Medhātithi[1] implies a closer bond of union among certain professions than those ordinarily covered by the term guild. For these closely-knit associations he employs the term gaṇa and says that they always function collectively (gaṇa-śaścārinah or sambhūyakārinah). The examples of such bodies cited by Medhatithi are masons (gṛhaprāsadādikarāḥ) and temple-priests. He says that the gaṇas of these people investigate the disputes arising among themselves and appoint committees to enforce their decisions. Elsewhere Medhātithi[2] observes that among architects, masons, carpenters and the like who work jointly their several shares according to the agreement of the group (sva-samaya-prasiddho yāvān-aṁśaḥ) shall be allotted on the principle that the man who does the most laborious and difficult parts of the work receives more, and he who does the easier parts receives less.

It appears that by this period the importance of the chief of the guild within the organisation had increased. The tendency seems to have started earlier,[3] as is suggested by an inscription

---

1. On Manu VIII.2.
2. Ibid. 211.
3. J.E.S.H.O., II.283.

of 465 A.D.[1] which mentions one Jīvanta as heading the oilmen's guild at Indor. Aparārka[2] utilises Bṛhaspati to establish the power of the head of a guild to reprimand, condemn and even excommunicate wrong-doers. In the inscriptions of our period we often find references to heads of guilds. Thus the Karitalai inscription mentions the chief (pradhāna) of the vāgūlikas (traders in betel-leaves)[3]. In the Jhalarapatan inscription of 1086 A.D. we have reference to a tailika-paṭṭakila or the head of a guild of oilmen.[4] A tailikarāja (chief of the guild of oilmen) is mentioned in an inscription from Shergadh.[5] In the Gwalior inscription[6] we meet many chiefs of the oil-millers (tailika-mahattaka). We likewise find references to the chiefs of the gardeners (mālika-mahara)[7], of the distillers of liquor (kallapāla-mahattaka)[8] and of the betel-sellers (tāmbolika-mahara)[9]. It appears that the chief could accept any endowment and in fulfilling it could impose a cess on the members of the guild.[10]

---

1. C.I.I., III no.16.
2. p.794.
3. C.I.I., IV no.42 ll.33-34.
4. J.A.S.B., 1914, pp.241-43.
5. E.I., XXIII.138.
6. E.I., I.159ff.
7. Ibid., ll.17.
8. Ibid., p.175 l.26.
9. Ibid., p.174 ll.8-10.
10. Ibid.

We also find that in one case a temple built by the chief of a guild received endowments from the members of his profession.[1] The accentuated importance of the heads of guilds is reflected in the Smṛticandrikā[2] which discusses in detail the situation when the samūhas find themselves incapable of stopping the insolence of their mukhyas (chiefs). In such cases the king was required to interfere and to set the chief on the proper path. If the mukhyas was still recalcitrant he was to be fined on a graduated scale according to the extent of his solvency, sometimes even suffering the confiscation of all his property, and in extreme cases he was to be banished from the kingdom by the king, who alone was competent to inflict such punishments. The text however adds that if the samūhas is at all competent to do so, it alone shall exercise this authority to punish the chief.

The details of the working of the guilds in the legal works of the period do not show any improvement upon the rules in the Smṛtis. Thus the Smṛticandrikā says that because of differences of opinion among their members, who are unlimited in number, the samūhas are incapable of deciding unanimously

---

1. B.N.Puri, History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras, pp.131f.
2. III pp.530f.

and should therefore appoint boards of two, three or five superintendents (kāryacintakas). Likewise it requires the members to obey not only the superintendents but also those who, though not belonging to the group, advise for its good. It likewise gives the samūhas power to punish members who are hostile to the advisers, deny a speaker his opportunity, make an unreasonable speech, betray secrets, create dissensions, or are guilty of similar offences.[1] We have already seen how, according to Medhātithi, the guilds were keen to protect themselves from frequent interference by the king's officers.[2]

The legal works of the period also refer to the power of the guilds to frame rules to regulate their activities. Thus the Smṛticandrikā[3] shows that the guilds might decree that a certain commodity was not tok be sold on a particular day, or that it was to be sold by a particular guild alone. From inscriptions we know that the guilds could impose on their members periodical cesses, sometimes in consideration of an amount paid to or deposited with them.[4]

It would appear that even in this period some of the guilds

---

1. III pp.526f.
2. On Manu VIII.2.
3. III part 1, p.66.
4. E.I., XXIV.333-36. See ibid., p.333.

still had their armed forces. In support of this we have not only the inclusion of guild troops in the traditional six kinds of troops[1] but also the clear testimony of the Mānasollāsa[2] which distinctly describes śreṇībala as the troop of those who are connected through caste and profession (janma-karma) and who have entered into a compact (niścitaṃ samayaiḥ).

The number eighteen for the guilds is found in the Triṣaṣṭi-śalākāpurusacarita[3] but for specific names we have to rely on the Jambūdvīpaprajñapti.[4] The text mentions guilds of kumbhāras (potters), paṭṭaillas[5] (weavers), suvaṇṇakāras (goldsmiths), sūvakāras (cooks), gandhavvas (musicians), kāsavaggas (barbers), mālākāras (garland-makers or gardeners), kaccohakaras (rope-makers), tambolias (betel-sellers), cammayarus (leather-workers), jantapīlagas[6] (oil-pressers), gañchias[7], chimpāyas (cloth-printers), kaṃsakāras (braziers), sīvagas (tailors), guāras (? gopāla,

---

1. Agnipurāna, CCXLII.1-2.
2. I p.79 v.558.
3. I.258; III.316. See also Padmānandamahākāvya, XVI.193.
4. 43 p.193.
5. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp.264ff leaves the expression unexplained. Johnson, Trisastisalākā, I pp.258f, f.n.315 suggests head of a village. We feel that it is a mistake for Skt. pattakāra.
6. A.K.Majumdar, loc. cit. translates it as presser of sugarcane. Johnson, loc. cit. has presser of grain.
7. The Deśīnāmamālā, II.84 takes it to mean varuḍa a low-caste man.

cow-herds), bhillas[1] and dhīvaras (fishermen). Al-Bīrūnī[2] mentions fowlers, shoe-makers, jugglers, basket and shield-makers, sailors, fishermen, hunters of wild animals and birds and weavers as the eight classes of people who formed guilds. It is to be noted that he does not refer to guilds of craftsmen but confines himself to those who are generally regarded as the antyajas. The legal works of the period mention some names in discussing guilds. Thus Medhātithi[3] mentions artisans, tradesmen, money-lenders and coach-drivers. The Mitākṣarā[4] refers to the horse-dealers (heḍāḅukas), weavers, shoe-makers and betel-sellers. The Smṛticandrikā[5] mentions only weavers. Guilds referred to in the inscriptions include those of oilmen (tailika)[6], betel-sellers (tāmbolika)[7], distillers of liquor (kallapāla)[8], gardeners (mālikā)[9] and elephant-drivers (mahāmātra)[10].

---

1. The bhillas were the aborigines inhabiting forests and often robbing travellers and caravans and indulged in slave-trade. They had a close group life with a chief exercising the highest power, which probably explains their inclusion in this list.
2. I.101.
3. On Manu VIII.41.
4. On Yāj., II.30.
5. II p.223.
6. E.I., I.159f l.16. Also ibid., XXIII.138.
7. E.I., I.175 l.26. Also C.I.I., IV no.42 l.34.
8. E.I., I.174 ll.8-10. Also C.I.I., IV no.42 l.33.
9. E.I., I.159f l.19; XXIV.331.
10. C.I.I., IV no.120 ll.4ff.

We know from earlier Smṛtis that the new member of a guild learned his craft or trade from an elder member whom he served as an apprentice. It appears from the Kṛtyakalpataru[1] that this form of carrying down the knowledge of the craft in the guilds was still alive in this period. The text however aimed at making the rules of apprenticeship more humane. Thus it tried to curb the power of the master to punish the apprentice. It explains the power of the master to order the vadha of the apprentice if the latter is wicked as meaning only beating him with a bamboo-stick and adds that it merely empowers the master to inflict some corporal punishment.

---

1. Vyavahārakāṇḍa, p.384.

CHAPTER VI - INLAND TRADE

Inter-state trade continued in our period. This is obvious from the fact that many important items of daily use like spices, luxury goods, metals and salt which were used in all parts of India came from different regions. We need not list literary or epigraphic references to prove that commodities of one part were being consumed in other parts.

Medhātithi makes a reference to the vaiśyas as carrying on inter-state trade. He is not satisfied merely with referring to the travels for trade on land and water as one of the functions of a vaiśya but specifically refers also to his importing useful goods from other states into the kingdom in which he lives.[1] Later on he advises that a vaiśya should know the states where large supplies of vrīhi are available, the time when barley is profuse, the custom of the states, the nature of the people, the advantages and disadvantages relating to the different states[2] and also the languages of Mālava, Magadha, Draviḍa and other countries, i.e., in such a country this word is employed to denote this thing.[3]

---

1. On Manu I.90, 31.
2. Ibid. IX.331.
3. Ibid. IX.332.

We have many references to indicate that traders of one part of India visited other parts. Thus we read in the Samarāiccakahā that a merchant named Dharaṇa belonging to the city called Mākandi goes to Acalapura, sells his goods by taking certain portion of profit and spending some time in purchase and sale finally returned with merchandise fit for trade at Mākandi.[1] The Kathāsaritsāgara[2] refers to the son of a merchant who was ordered by his father to go to another country where he had some business interests. Another story in the same text speaks of a merchant of Pāṭaliputra going to Valabhī on business.[3] The Kuvalayamālākathā refers to merchants of the different regions of north and south meeting together.[4] An inscription from Ahar (Udaipur) dated V.S. 1010[5] mentions merchants from Karṇāṭa, Madhyadeśa, Lāṭa and Ṭakka (the region between the upper waters of the Chenab and the Ravi)[6] coming to the place and agreeing to pay a levy on their articles of sale. A similar agreement arrived at by horse dealers from different parts is recorded in the Pehoa (Karnal) inscription dated 882-83 A.D.[7]

The commercial contact between the different regions is to

---

1. VI p.16.
2. p.85.
3. p.130.
4. Apabhraṃśa-kāvyatrayī (G.O.S.), Introduction, p.91.
5. Prācīnalekhamālā, Vol. II p.24.
6. D.H.N.I., I p.119.
7. E.I., I.186.

be studied in the background of the cultural intercourse between them. The frequent religious journeys to the places of pilgrimage (tīrthas) scattered throughout the country must have kept alive the contacts between the different parts.[1] Educational centres in one part of the country attracted students from all corners of the country. We can form some idea of the number of students coming to Kashmir from Bengal from the fact that Kṣemendra in presenting the typical characters in the Kashmirian society devotes the sixth chapter of his Deśopadeśa to the evil manners and the vulgar attitude of the students from Gauḍa studying in Kashmir. It would appear that people frequently visited other parts of the country. Thus according to the Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] for the residence of the people from Madhyadeśa, Lāṭa and Saurāṣṭra a maṭha was constructed by queen Diddā. In our support we may refer to an inscription from Elleswaram (Nalgonda, Andhra) in florid Nāgarī characters of about the tenth century which mentions a rājaputra from Varendri-viṣaya (north Bengal).[3] It is well known that saint Nimbārka a south Indian went to the birthplace of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and for long years resided there. The educative and cultural values of travelling

---

1. Indian Archaeology, 1957-58, p.55.
2. VI.300.
3. Indian Archaeology, 1955-56, p.30.

have been emphatically brought out by the Kuṭṭanīmata[1] which says that those who have not travelled, and are ignorant of the manners, customs and character of alien peoples, and have thus not learned to pay respect to the respectable, are like bulls without horns. From the land-grants we find that pious and learned families of the brāhmaṇas travelled far and wide, and receiving donations at the hands of a patronising king settled in distant lands. Thus we find many brāhmaṇa families migrating from Madhyadeśa to Bengal, Malwa, Dakṣiṇa Kośala, Orissa and many other countries. Even in the far south in the Pāṇḍya kingdom there was a large settlement of brāhmaṇas from Magadha.[2] Many brāhmaṇa families from Bengal are known to have settled in Orissa, Mālava and the Deccan.[3] In the land-grants of Bengal we have references to the settlements in Bengal of brāhmaṇas coming from Lāṭa, Madhyadeśa and many other places. The career of Bilhaṇa illustrates how scholars and poets in the period covered long distances in search of patronage. From Kashmir he went to Mathurā and then passing through Kannauj and Prayāga reached Banaras. Staying at the court of the Kalacuri king Karṇa for

---

1. v. 211.
2. I.A., 1893, p.74.
3. History of Bengal, I pp.581 f.
4. Ibid., p.579 f.n. 1. Also D.C.Ganguly, History of the Paramāra Dynasty, p.240; Barua, Cultural History of Assam, p.109.

some years he went to Dhārā, Anahilavāḍa and Somanātha. From the port of Berāvala he sailed for Hoṇāvara near Gokarṇa. Travelling towards south he went upto Rāmeśvaram. Finally he moved north and for many years enjoyed the patronage of the Western Cālukya king Vikramāditya. The speed with which ideas travelled from one part of the country to another indicates the close contacts between them. Thus the commentary of Aparārka, though written in southern India, seems to have become popular in Kashmir within a few years of its composition.[1] The Gāhaḍavāla dynasty is known to have maintained close relations with southern India which are reflected in the names of some of the revenue items appearing in the land-grants.[2] We learn that king Harṣa introduced in Kashmir some of the dresses, ornaments and coin-types of southern India.[3]

The merchants who participated in the inter-state trade generally travelled in groups. Viśvarūpa[4] explains naigama (corporation of the merchants) as a group of caravan traders and others. Aparārka explains the term to mean traders of different castes who travel together for the purposes of carrying out trade

---

1. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, II.333f,
2. Kumāragadiāṇaka and yamalikāmbali.
3. Rāj., VII.921-26.
4. On Yāj., II.192 - sārthavāhādisamūho naigamaḥ.
5. p.796 - saha deśāntaravāṇijyārthaṃ ye nānājātiyā adhigacchanti te naigamāḥ.

with other countries. In the popular stories of the period we often read of a merchant and caravan leader, approaching the king of another state and offering valuable presents in order to secure his permission to do business[1]. The Tilakamañjarī[2] in speaking of the outskirts of a city mentions the caravans as camping there. The caravans were regarded as a safe protection against the robbers infesting the highways. A verse in the Suvṛttatilaka[3] says that in pride of power a man in the company of his caravan paces across the extremely dreadful wilderness made all the more terrible by pitiless robbers.

From the Bhavisayattakahā[4] we learn that the big merchants before proceeding on their caravan journey used to proclaim their intention to the other merchants in the city and invite them to join them by offering a number of facilities. In the Samarāiccakahā[5] the leader of the caravan tells the travellers, when they had collected, the advantages of the route he proposes to take and gives them many pieces of advice for their guidance. The Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita[6] gives a vivid description of the

---

1. Bṛhatkathākośa, LV.200ff.
2. p.117.
3. p.11 (II.29).
4. pp.16f.
5. pp.476f.
6. Vol. I pp.7ff.

journey by the caravan under the leadership of a wealthy merchant Dhana in the city Kṣitipratiṣṭhita. Planning to go with much merchandise to another city he proclaimed with the beat of drums throughout the city his proposed journey and invited others to go with him. He offered to give merchandise to those without it, conveyance to those who had no conveyances, companions to the friendless, and provisions to those lacking in provisions and to protect his weak followers from robbers and from attacks by wild animals on the way and to cherish them like relatives.[1] At an auspicious moment propitious rites were performed by high-born women and the merchant ascended his chariot and went outside the city. All the people who were going to Vasantapura came there at the sound of the drum of departure. Then the caravan set out with horses, camels, carts and oxen. Dhana went at the head of the caravan and a friend of his, Maṇibhadra, brought up the rear. They advanced unhindered, attended by multitudes of horsemen at their sides. The merchandise, difficult to carry, was carried by camels, buffaloes, fine oxen, mules and donkeys. The mules had sacks on their sides. The merchants were sitting in carts which looked like moving houses. The

---

1. It was not out of economic considerations that he offered such generous terms. The explanation is to be sought probably in the Jain piety.

huge-bodied and high-shouldered buffaloes were carrying water. The camels were carrying large loads. Surrounded on all sides by armed guards, the caravan advanced safely along the road; robbers, fearing its might, stayed at a distance from the caravan. Dhana was equally eager for the poor man's obtaining and the rich man's enjoying and led them all as befits a true leader.

In the summer season members of the caravan stopped at every tree near a pond and took rest and drank water. The travellers alleviated the fatigue caused by the scorching heat of summer by fans made of leaves. We read of the presence of matrons also in the caravan.

In rains as a result of the impassability of the road from the water, thorns, and mud, two miles seemed like eight hundred. Travellers advanced very slowly, and were covered with new mud up to the knees "as if they had put on boots". The carts mired everywhere in the terrible mud on the road. The camels led by ropes by their riders who had dismounted, slipped at every step and fell on the road. When the merchant Dhana noticed the impassability of the road, he stopped and made a camp at that very place in the forest. To pass the season thatched huts were made. In course of time provisions of food were exhausted and everyone got very worried.

But one morning Dhana found that the roads had become easily

passable with their mud dried up by the sun's rays. Thinking that it was time for departure the merchant had the departure drum sounded. At the sound of the drum the caravan set out. Dhana himself set out only after providing for the protection of the caravan by guards in front, at the rear, and at the sides. After crossing the great forest the caravan travelling without hindrance arrived at Vasantapura. In a short time Dhana sold his merchandise and took exchange goods. Thereafter he returned to his own city Kṣitipratiṣṭhita.

In this description we have noticed a reference to the beasts of burden. Medhātithi[1] makes a clear reference to these carts (gantrī) and describes them as drawn by bullocks, mules, buffaloes and other animals and adds that these same animals also when ridden upon may be taken as denoting conveyances. The Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa[2] mentions as a peculiar custom of its time the prohibition of a householder's riding camels or cars drawn by them. This probably reflects the opinion prevailing in the eastern regions of northern India about the use of camels which probably had not become very popular outside the desert areas.

It would appear that providing for transport and conveyance

---

1. On Manu VIII.290.
2. XXIV.26

was a very lucrative business in this period. In the Upamiti-bhavaprapañcākathā[1] the list of trades and professions which were supposed to yield the highest income makes a prominent reference to sending caravans of large carts and providing of herds of big camels and mules. The Līlāvatī[2] poses a mathematical problem to calculate the cart-hire for transporting logs of wood of given dimensions over a specified distance.

The rules for hiring a conveyance or a labourer to transport merchandise which appear in earlier legal texts[3] would seem to have held ground in our period also. The commentaries do not have much new legislation on the point and are concerned only with clarifying the existing rules. But by way of elucidation they add more details. Thus Medhātithi[4] says that a merchant borrowing a wheeled conveyance but not actually proceeding on his journey is not to pay the entire amount of interest stipulated; when the oxen go a long distance, it involves much labour on their part, so that it is right that the reward of their owner should be commensurate with that labour; but when they have returned sooner than stipulated, it is open to the owner to make further profit on them by hiring them out afresh. The

---

1. pp.867-68.
2. p.35 (no. 84).
3. Nārada VI.7-9; Yāj., II.197.
4. On Manu VIII.156.

same rule applies to the cases like those where a man takes bullocks for a month but returns them earlier.

In the dictionaries of the period we have many terms for a carriage street, a small street, a high street and a high road.[1] The Deśīnāmamālā gives many terms which it explains as rathyā[2] (a carriage street) or laghurathyā[3] (small carriage street) but we cannot find out if there was any minute technical difference in the meaning of these. It is significant that the Abhidhāna-ratnamālā[4] mentions the terms in connection with a city. The Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra[5] also speaks of many kinds of roads in its chapter on the lay-out of a city. No doubt the villages did not have well-planned streets like those in a city. But it would appear that they were often connected with the high roads. In many land-grants highways are mentioned in connection with the enumeration of the boundaries of the donated land.[6]

The important roads seem to have been well demarcated with mile stones. In giving the details of the important trade routes the Arab accounts mention the exact distance between any two places. It would be reasonable to suppose that these accounts

---

1. Vaijayantī, p.160 ll.31-33; Abhidhānaratnamālā, v.289.
2. III.31; IV.8; VI.39; VII.55; VIII.6; I.145.
3. III.31.
4. v.289.
5. I p.39 vv.6-14.
6. I.B., III.158ff; Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī, p.180.

were based on the actual distances as recorded in the milestones erected by the state.

But the condition of the roads would appear to have been far from satisfactory. We have already seen in the passage from the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita that during the rains the roads were often impassable. In the Sandeśarāsaka[1] it is said that in the rainy season the travellers with shoes in hand waded through the waters, waves roared in rivers rendered uncrossable and travellers had to halt midway, using boats if business still forced them to travel. The roads do not appear to have been well maintained. We often read of the rugged character of the road.[2] The uneven nature of the roads was a general complaint which deterred people from undertaking a journey.[3] The number of well maintained and regular roads would not seem to have been very large. Medhātithi[4] speaks of an army on its march cutting down the trees, bushes and creepers obstructing the path, and levelling the undulations of the ground, preparing fords in rivers and steps to cross the ravines, destroying the wild animals besetting the path, winning over the path-finders to its side, and getting together supplies of food and fodder etc. In

---

1. vv.141-42.
2. Dohākośa, p.311 (XIV.20).
3. Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā, p.863 - viṣamā mārgāḥ.
4. On Manu VII.185.

the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita[1] also it is said in connection with the march of an army that ten thousand men, carrying axes and pickaxes, cut the tree etc. from their road and made its ground level. The Kuṭṭanīmata[2] gives a very dismal picture of the difficulties which a traveller had to face. At the fall of day he drags himself to some village, his body covered with rags, his strength exhausted by the long march, all grey with a layer of dust, and asks for shelter in very humble words. He is greeted with rebukes and harsh words and if he is fortunate enough to get after great difficulty and increasing vehemence of his prayers a seat in the corner of an old hut the neighbouring housewives flock to express their apprehension of his being a thief. Having thus visited a hundred houses and suffered the tortures of privation, the unfortunate traveller will soon come down to begging by the roadside a meagre handful of rice or beans, of peas or lentils. The text discourages travelling, extols the joy of remaining in one's own house, and adds that a traveller's food depends upon the caprice of others; the earth is ~~is~~ his bed, the temple is his home and a broken brick is his pillow. This account applies only to the poor traveller and intentionally exaggerates the horrors of travelling with a view

---

1. IV p.325.
2. vv.218-29.

to discouraging a man from undertaking it.

We have references to public supplies of water on the roadside.[1] The Tilakamañjarī[2] describes a water reservoir for the use of travellers on the outskirts of a city. Its banks were surrounded by circular white-washed cloister (varaṇḍikā), it was made of compact piles of bricks and had rows of stairs going down into water. In the Samayamātṛkā[3] we read of a woman who kept an inn (pānthāvasatha-pālikā). There were small shops of general merchants who used to supply the travellers and caravanmen with provisions for their journeys. The mathematical texts[4] give mathematical problems in which a traveller asks a shopkeeper to hurry and supply him with provisions for a certain amount of money. As in earlier texts providing facilities and comforts for travellers is mentioned in the texts of this period as an act of merit. In the Kṛtyakalpataru water-giving and building water-sheds is mentioned under miscellaneous gifts.[5] Hemādri[6] and later writers devote a separate section to the merit of providing wells and water-sheds in desert places and roads and giving a pot filled with cool water to a traveller. This

---

1. Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa, V p.22; Deśīnāmamāla, VIII.21.
2. p.117.
3. II.3.
4. Bījagaṇita, p.255; Līlāvatī, pp.39f no. 97.
5. Dāna, pp. 257a, 261, 263.
6. Caturvargacintāmaṇi, Dānakhaṇḍa, pp.421ff.

aspect of charitable work was noticed by Abū Zaid Ḥasan[1] who says that one part of the devotion of the Indians consists in building inns upon the highways for the accommodation of travellers, where they also set up dealers, of whom the passengers may purchase what they want. Tejapāla, the minister of Vīradhavala, is said to have constructed many water-sheds.[2] In the Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha[3] we have a reference to a charitable house where travellers were shaved, attended to and massaged. From the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[4] it would follow that conscientious kings maintained charitable houses (sattrāgāra) where travellers coming from other parts were given food, hot water and oil to wash their feet to remove fatigue and a room to pass the night. In the Tilakamañjarī[5] the king is found making the officers incharge resume providing food, drink, beds and medicine to the poor, orphans, travellers and caravan-men in the charitable houses which had been reported as closed down.

In some of the land-grants of our period[6] the list of officers addressed includes gāmāgāmika who probably not only kept

---

1. Ancient Accounts of India and China, pp.67f.
2. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p.99 l.29.
3. XVIII.355-56.
4. p. 106 ll. 4-7.
5. p. 66.
6. C.I.I., IV nos. 7, 25, 26.

a watch on persons coming into or going out of the village but also looked to their comforts.

In the plains of northern India rivers were often a better and safer means of travelling and of transporting merchandise than roads. The Caryāpadas[1] often illustrate their philosophy with the help of similes drawn from the life of a boatman, the construction of the boats and the actual method of plying boats. It would appear from the Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa[2] that river traffic was very common in eastern U.P. and the boatmen had gained an intimate knowledge of the course of the rivers and their depth at different places. In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[3] we find many references to river journeys. Some of the rivers in Assam also seem to have been used for transport and travelling.[4]

Ferry dues seem to have been an important source of state income. Officers in charge of ferries are often mentioned in the records of our period.[5] The fiscal expression svanaukā-bhāṭaka appearing in one of the Gāhaḍavāla records[6] would suggest that the state had its own boats which could be used by private persons and boatmen by paying the necessary fare. The state

---

1. Bauddha Gāna O' Dohā, vv. 13, 38, 49. See also Caryāgītikoṣa, Introduction, p.21.
2. p. 46 l. 11; p. 39 l. 7.
3. V.84; VII.347, 714, 1628.
4. P.C.Choudhury, History of Civilisation of Assam, p. 379.
5. Tarika and tarapati.
6. Candravati grant of Candradeva dated V.S. 1150 - E.I., XIV.193-96.

would seem to have kept strict control over the ferries. In the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[1] we read that when once Bhoja fell seriously ill the officers, who did not want the news to spread, controlled the roads leading to the fords and completely stopped the coming of the people from other states.

It is however to be noticed that though bridges seem to have been constructed in the hilly areas of Assam and Kashmir, they were not very fashionable in the plains. In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] there is a reference to the making of boat-bridges over the river Vitastā as early as the reign of Pravarasena II (6th century A.D.). In later times also we read of the erection of boat-bridges. Thus Sujji is said to have constructed a boat-bridge over the river Gambhīrā which was of great advantage to him in the battle of Gambhīrā.[3] From the Muslim accounts we learn that there were in Assam stone bridges over the rivers and the soldiers of Assam defeated the attack of Bakhtyār Khaljī by destroying one of these.[4] But in the plains bridges do not seem to have been much in use. In the literary references we find no instance when people are said to have crossed a river by a bridge. The commentary of Medhātithi supplies us with negative

---

1. p.51 ll. 13-15.
2. III.354.
3. VIII.1502.
4. Raverty, Ṭabaqāt-i-Nāsirī, pp.569f.

evidence on this point. Thus in describing the march of an army it speaks of cutting the trees, thickets and creepers obstructing the path, levelling the ground and preparing fords in rivers and ravines, but is silent about the construction or repair of bridges.[1] Likewise Medhātithi explains saṁkrama (crossing) in Manu[2] not as a bridge but as a contrivance by which people enter the water to bathe. The commentary on the Rāma-carita[3] speaks of Rāmapāla, when he went out to crush the Kaivarta rebellion as crossing the Gaṅgā on a bridge of boats.

The volume of trade in our period seems to have gone down as a result of the insecurity of the highways. The absence of a strong central power led to the growth of feudal anarchy and the increase in the power of unsocial elements. This state of affairs would appear to have begun in the period of political disintegration following the disappearance of the Guptas from the scene. It is significant that Fa-hsien was never troubled by robbers in his journey through northern India, but Hsüan Tsang was twice molested by them.[4] In the Sandeśa-rāsaka[5] a traveller describes the night journey as troublesome because the road is difficult and is full of perils. We have seen above in

---

1. On Manu VII.185.
2. IX.285 - Saṁkramaḥ. Yena saṁkrāmanti mārgenāvataranti jalopasparśādinā nimittena.
3. II.10 - Gaṅgāyāṃ taraṇi sambhavena naukāmelakena.
4. The Life, pp.60f, 73f, 86, 198ff. See also I-tsing, pp. xxxi-xxxiii.
5. v. 117 - maggu duggamu sabhaü.

the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita passage that the caravans often stood in danger from the robbers on the highways and it was only the armed guard that kept the robbers away. The Upamitibhava-prapañcākathā refers to the general fear the merchants had for robbers.[1] It was not unusual for a caravan to be looted by the robbers infesting a forest. In the popular stories of the period we often read of the merchants and their caravans being attacked by forest tribes or robber chiefs.[2] In one of his songs Bhūsuku tells that when after crossing the Padmā canal he reached East Bengal the dacoits took away whatever he had in his boat.[3] The Rājataraṅgiṇī[4] speaks of a powerful robber chief and his gang near Gaya who had become a scourge to wayfarers.

It would appear that the merchants feared not only the gangs of professional robbers but also petty feudal chiefs who, taking advantage of the existing political chaos and the weakness of the central authority, found robbery highly profitable. Medhātithi interprets the injunction in Manu[5] to consider the welfare (yogakṣema) of the merchants in imposing taxes on them to refer to the apprehension of or freedom from robbery from both king and robbers while the merchants are passing through a

---

1. p.863.
2. Upamiti, pp. 633f; Kathākoṣa, p.207.
3. Bauddha Gān O' Dohā, v.49.
4. VII.1009.
5. VII.127- "Yogakṣemam" aranye kāntāre vā gacchato rājabhayam caurabhayam niścauratā vetyādi.

forest. From the Muslim accounts we learn that it was a problem for the early Muslim rulers to deal effectively with petty feudal chiefs who molested and plundered traders on the highways.[1] We can fairly assume that these chiefs had started looting and robbing even earlier when the absence of a central power strong enough to curb them helped the feudal tendencies to gain momentum. Significantly enough the Vastupālacarita[2] mentions a feudal chief (maṇḍalīka) named Ghūghula who used to plunder the caravans of merchants. The career of Lakṣmana, the founder of the Cāhamāna dynasty of Nadol, would suggest that the feudal chiefs of the period often indulged in such activities. As convincingly suggested by D.Sharma[3] the traditions recorded in the Purātanaprabandhasaṅgraha and Nainsī's Khyāt indicate that Lakṣmaṇa robbed some caravan of all its horses and that his looting expedition extended to the confines of Mewar and Gujarat.

The political vicissitudes of the time and the frequent feudal raids and internecine wars must also have hampered trade by adding to the insecurity and disturbances created by other factors. Medhātithi[4] speaks of the merchants who prepare to go

---

1. Elliot and Dowson, II p.380 for the Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī. See also Habib, Introduction (pp.73f) to Elliot and Dowson Vol. II.
2. p. 100.
3. Early Chauhān Dynasties, pp. 121f.
4. On Manu VIII.156.

on a trading journey to a distant city but are unable to do so, being forced back by difficulties in the form, among other things of political upheavals and disturbances (rāṣṭropaplava). An important argument which a mother puts forward to dissuade her son from going out with a caravan to trade is the danger of war.[1] The Prabandhacintāmaṇi[2] speaks of travelling becoming difficult due to the political insecurity and turmoil about the year V.S. 1277.

In some of the commentaries of our period we find an ignorance about the use of the term sārtha for a caravan in the original text. Thus the Parāśaramādhavīya[3] explains it as the assemblage of people collected on the occasion of village festivities and mentions the village headmen as an illustration of its chief. The Vyavahāraprakāśa[4] agrees with this and explains sārthavāha as the chief of the assemblage of people collected on the occasion of village festivities and religious ceremonies. Likewise Bhaṭṭotpala[5] explains sārtha as a group of people and calls its chief arthapati. We may suggest that this confusion about the real import of the term was really due to the fact that caravan journeys had ceased to be made so frequently as in earlier periods.

---

1. Bhavisayattakahā, p.17 - Vihi paḍikūlu amha paḍisakkaï. Atthahaṁ cheü karibi ko sakkaï.
3. III p.25-Sārthino grāmayātrādau milita janasaṅghaḥ. Mukhyā grāmaṇyādayaḥ.
2. p.100 ll.8f-Rājyavikalatāyāṃ tīrthamārgāṇāṃ vaisamyam.
4. p.9-Sārtho grāmadevayātrādau milito janasaṅghaḥ tanmukhyāḥ sārthavāhādayaḥ.
5. On B.Ś., LXXXV.11-Sārthe pradhānam - sārthe janasamūhe pradhā-

atim.

CHAPTER VII - FOREIGN TRADE (A) LAND ROUTE.

The Himalayan ranges on the north-west of India have through their passes provided a convenient passage not only to invading hordes from outside but also to daring merchants on both sides. The overland route connected India on the one hand with China and on the other with Persia, Arabia and Asia Minor. The trade across these overland routes has been vitally affected by the policies of the state and the political stability in the areas concerned. Under the Kuṣāṇas this trade was in a flourishing condition. The growth of the Hūṇa power had a serious impact upon the trade activity. We find the Hūṇas spreading over the entire western half of the overland route passing through Central Asia. But it would appear that trade between Europe and the Orient continued even during these times of turmoil. The appearance of Islam seriously diminished the volume of European commerce. The two religions across the Mediterranean being unfriendly, the free flow of commerce between the areas on its two sides was severely affected.[1]

The Arabs created difficulties for this trade in the early years of the expansion of Islam. We have the testimony of I-tsing[2] who speaks of the Ta-shih as interfering with travel

---

1. H.Pirenne, Economic and Social History of Medieval Europe, pp. 1-3.
2. Chavannes, Religieux eminents, 25.

on the road to Kapiśa. We may connect their expansion towards Central Asia with their desire to control the overland trade between the east and the west. The Arabs made repeated attempts to advance towards India though it was only in 712 that they succeeded in occupying Sind and Multan. They only gained control of the route passing through north-western India in about 1022 A.D.

In the first half of the seventh century the Chinese empire had carried its influence to the borders of Persia.[1] From the Chinese sources we learn that the period roughly from 650 to 750 witnessed a quadrangular struggle between the Turks, the Tibetans, the Arabs and the Chinese for the occupation of Central Asia.[2] The period is characterised by a considerable expansion of Tibetan arms. The Tibetans were troublesome neighbours for the Chinese. They established their hegemony over Central Asia, especially the regions in the north-east and south-east and appear to have expanded their influence southwards to Bengal. It is not without significance that Al Iṣtakhrī and Ibn Haukal call the Bay of Bengal the Tibetan Sea.[3]

The Indian states specially those in the north felt the

---

1. Yule, Cathay, I.98ff.
2. Tsui Chi, A Short history of Chinese civilisation, p. 144.
3. Reinaud, Aboulfeda, I p. ccclviii.

impact of this struggle.[1] It has been suggested that Kashmir was a subordinate ally of the Chinese in the seventh century and it was Chinese aid in men and money which led to the spectacular rise of Kashmir in the period. Kashmir fought against the Arabs, Tukhāras and Daradas and blocked the route to Tibet. We may add that the policy of Karkoṭa Kashmir of aggrandisement in the North Indian plains may also be attributed in the same manner to a desire to bring to an end the expansion of Tibetan arms in Bengal.

The Chinese seem to have been much concerned with the threat from Tibet and were earnestly trying to enlist the sympathies of Indian powers on their side. The Chinese sources represent the Pallavas as begging Chinese aid agianst the Arabs and the Tibetans.[2] We may legitimately suspect the correctness of this. It is clear that the southern Indian state had not much to fear from these powers and it was the Chinese emperor who had sought the help of the Pallavas. We learn from the Chinese sources that the Chinese emperor in 787 applied to the Uighurs, the princes of India and the Caliph of Baghdad for alliances against the Tibetans.[3]

It is fair to expect that the Tibetans must have decreased

---

1. I.H.Q., XXX.89-92.
2. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p. 16.
3. Ibid., p. 17.

the volume of trade flowing between India and China. It is probably to this that the Chinese narratives refer when they observe that towards 758-60 China having lost the country of Holong (according to Yule Khulum in the valley of the Oxus) the kings of India ceased to send homage.[1] From the accounts of Abū Zaid we get a hint of commercial rivalry between Tibet and China. He observes that the musk of Tibet is far preferable to that of China.[2]

Abū Zaid indicates that by his time the Central Asian route had once again come into use. He describes the route between Transoxiana and China but at the same time notes that it is a two months journey through impracticable deserts and through a country covered with sand, where no water is to be found. Daring traders could be found who with a vessel full of musk on their backs travelled on foot from Samarkand to Khanfu (Canton), but their number was hardly worth taking note.[3] Ma Tuan-lin and the Sung-shï speak of the journey in the east of Fu-lin starting from western Ta-shï to Yü-tien (Khotan), Hui-ho, Ch'ing-t'ang and then finally to China.[4] The Sung-shï further refers to a priest of the Wëi-chou returning to China from the Western

---

1. Cathay, I.72.
2. Ancient Accounts of India and China, p. 76.
3. Ibid., pp. 75-76.
4. F.Hirth, China and the Roman Orient, pp. 62, 88f.

Regions with a foreign priest and presenting to the Emperor letters from the Prince of Northern India, and also from the Prince of the Diamond Throne (Vajrāsana, Bodhgaya) of Nālandā.[1] Some of the Buddhist monks travelling between India and China in the tenth century used the route from Kashmir, Peshawar, Khulum, Khotan, Kucha, Karashahr, I Chau (Kamul), Shaz Chau and Kan Chau and knew the route connecting Udyāna, Gandhāra, Nagarahāra, Lamghan, Ghazni and Persia.[2] We can demonstrate with the help of Chinese accounts how the Central Asian route was gradually being replaced by the sea-route.[3] Thus the Sui-shu at one place speaks of the kingdom of Ts'au or Ki-pin (Kabul) as having an-si-hiang, ts'ing-mu (putchuck) and other aromatic substances and in another context mentions an-si-hiang among the products of K'iu-tsĭ (Kuchar, Chinese Turkestan). The Pön-ts'au-kang-mu gives kü-peĭ-lo as the foreign name of an-si-hiang which is thus khādira (catechu) or kundura (Indan frankincense). It would follow from this that China received an-si-hiang from India through the overland route connecting Ki-pin and Kuchar. The Yu-yang-tsa-tsu in stating that an-si-hiang tree comes from Po-sĭ (Persia)x was obviously implying the existence of the

---

1. Chau Ju-kua, p.114 ll. 23ff.
2. Cathay, I.72-73.
3. Chau Ju-kua, pp. 201-2, f.n.

route across Central Asia. Significantly enough Chau Ju-kua is silent about an-si-hiang which indicates that it did not reach China in his time. The Pön-ts'ao would suggest that the transit across Central Asia was replaced by one across the seas by way of Indonesia. It says that formerly an-si-hiang came from Persia, but now Annan, San-fo-ts'i and all foreign countries have it.

The decline of the trade-route across Central Asia was to a great extent due to the loss of Chinese interest in it. This disinterest may have been due in part to their inability to control the Central Asian states. But even as early as the second half of the seventh century the sea-route between India and China was more in use than the overland route. Thus out of the sixty Chinese pilgrims to India mentioned by I-tsing thirty-seven are found to have gone by sea.[1] We have seen elsewhere the gradually increasing emphasis on sea-trade in the policy of China.[2] Kia Tan as quoted by Chau Ju-kua[3] explaining the preference for the sea-route says "As Ta-mo (Dharma)[4] came sailing across the sea to P'an-yü (Canton), we may fairly ask whether the sea journey is not more expeditious than the long overland one". The religious sanction was merly an excuse to

---

1. Chavannes, Mem. sur les Religieux eminents, passim.
2. See infra pp. 197-8, 202,
3. p. 97.
4. This is Bodhidharma, by now a legendary figure in China.

cover China's inability to participate in the overland trade.

It would appear that chaotic conditions on the route across north-western India and Central Asia led merchants to seek and develop possibilities in other directions. From very early times we have references to routes connecting India and China through the hills of Assam and Burma and through Sikkim, the Chumbi valley and Tibet. The report submitted by the Chinese ambassador Chang-kien would indicate that even about 126 B.C. a trade route connected southern China across upper Burma ultimately with Bactria.[1] From I-tsing we learn that in the third and fourth centuries some twenty Chinese priests came to India from Szuchuan through upper Burma.[2] The embassy to China sent by a king of the Kapili valley, referred to in the Shung-shu (420-479)[3], most likely used the route across upper Burma. From Hsüan-Tsang[4] also it appears that Kāmarūpa had contacts with China. In the early medieval period the route across upper Burma came in for greater use. The itinerary of Kia Tan (785-805 A.D.) gives a very detailed account of the land route from

---

~~1. p. 97.~~
1. See P.C.Bagchi, India and China, pp. 7f, 16f.
2. P.C.Choudhury, History of Civilisation of Assam, p. 381.
3. J.R.A.S., 1910, pp. 1187f.
4. Si-yu-ki, II pp. 195-98. See also P.C.Bagchi, India and China, pp. 200f.

Tonkin to Kāmarūpa, obviously implying a regular use of it. The route passed through Yunnansen, Yunnan-fou and Talifou; going westwards it crossed the Salween at Young-chang and then led to Chou-ko-leang to the east of Momein between Shiveli and the Salween. From Chou-ko-leang the main route passing through Si-li (halfway between Ta-gaung and Mandalay), Toumin (Pagan), Prome and the Arakan mountains reached Kāmarūpa. The minor route going to the west of Chou-ko-leang reached Teng Ch'ong (Momein) and then passing through Li-Shouei (on the Irrawaddy near Bhāmo) and crossing the river Māgaung finally reached Kamarupa through the town of Naganai.[1] In the tenth century some three hundred missionaries from China on their journey to India used this route through Yunnan.[2] Chau Ju-kua speaks of tradition saying that north of Kiau-chï (Tongking) one comes to Ta-li (Yün-nan), and west of Ta-li one comes to Wang-shö-ch'öng (Magadha) in less than forty days journey. He quotes Kia Tan to show that there was an overland route from Annam to T'ien-chu (India).[3] It is clear from all these references that there was a change between the time of Kia Tan and that of Chau Ju-kua and the land route had fallen into disfavour in comparison

---

1. P.C.Bagchi, India and China, pp. 18f.
2. R.C.Majumdar, Hindu Colonies in the Far East, pp. 226f.
3. p. 97.

with the sea-route. However even as late as the sixteenth century the route continued to be in use. An Indian Buddhist monk named Buddhagupta belonging to the sixteenth century refers in his biography to the well-known land route connecting Kamarupa and Burma and is said to have himself used this route in travelling from Gauhati to Pagan.[1]

Another overland route passed through Bihar to Tibet and on to China.[2] The route between Magadha and Tibet must have had greater use during the period of Tibetan expansion. The frequent journeys of Buddhist monks between Magadha and Tibet must have heightened the importance of the route.[3] The commercial intercouse between India and Tibet and China along the routes passing through Nepal radically influenced the economy of Nepal in our period. As pointed out by S.Levi[4] at the time when the History of the T'ang (618-905 A.D.) was compiled, merchants were numerous and cultivators rare in Nepal. The epigraphic records of earlier times reflect a rural community, but the growth of commercial activity through Nepal resulted in the growth of commerce and city life and the development

---

1. I.H.Q., VII.683-701.
2. It has been suggested that in the time of the Periplus and Ptolemy a route connected Assam with Bactria through Bhutan and Kabul-Choudhury, Assam, pp.383f. But the geographical obstacles on the suggested route make it highly impracticable for even the most daring mountaineer. It is obvious that to get from Assam to Bactria one would go by way of the Gaṅgā.
3. History of Bengal, I p.663.
4. Le Népal, II p.185.

of manual arts and industries. From the Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī[1] we learn that Bengal received large number of horses which merchants brought through this route. Between Kāmarūpa and Tibet it speaks of thirty-five mountain passes through which horses were brought to Lakhnauti in Bengal. A town variously named as Karam-bain, Laram-bain or Karambatan and situated somewhere at the foot of the Himalayas[2] was the centre of the trade in horses carried along the route from Tibet. All the saddle horses which Lakhnauti received are said to have been brought from that place. The Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī says that every morning about fifteen hundred horses were sold in the market of that city.

It was the lucrative trade passing through Tibet and Assam to China that led Mongols and also Indian kings to make efforts to dominate these routes. The possibilities of the trade impelled them to undertake daring expeditions along these difficult routes. Thus we read of a Mongol invasion of Bengal in 1244 "by way of Cathay Tibet". Bakhtyār Khaljī also advanced along the Assam valley. Malik Yuzbek undertook a similar enterprise in 1256-7. Muhammad Tughluq also sent an expedition against China but with no more success than the earlier

---

1. Elliot and Dowson, II pp. 311f.
2. Not as yet satisfactorily identified.

expeditions referred to above.[1]

We have evidence to suggest that Indian merchants actively participated in the trade along north-western India. It appears that though the Indians did not venture much into Central Asia they visited Iran going right up to the Oxus valley. Indian learning is found penetrating right up to Baghdad, sometimes through Iran and sometimes directly. The occupation of Sind by the Arabs brought India and the Muslim world closer to one another. During the reigns of Al-Manṣūr (754-775) and Harun Al-Rashīd (786-809) there was much direct intercourse with India. Under Harun Al-Rashīd the contact between the two regions became closer still through the active promotion by the ministers of the Barmak family. Standard Sanskrit works on medicine, mathematics, astrology, astronomy and philosophy were translated into Arabic and Indian specialists on these subjects were invited to Baghdad. It is but natural to suppose that trade must have followed in the wake of the cultural contact. Ibn Khordādbah gives a detailed account of a road to eastern countries from Karkūz in Persia and Sind and to Nārmasīrā on the boundary between Persia and Sind and connected with Debal.[3] For going to

---

1. Yule, Cathay, I pp. 78f.
2. See the Age of Imperial Kanauj, pp. 448-452.
3. Elliot and Dowson, I.14.

Sind Al-Bīrūnī mentions the route from the country of Nīmroz or Sijistān and for India from Kabul, and adds that this is not the only possible road.[1] The people living between Multan and Mansura had camels which were much sought after in Khurasan and other parts of Persia.[2] According to Al-Mas'ūdī Multan was the place where the caravans for Khurāsān assembled.[3] Al-Idrīsī speaks of cotton cloths made at Kabul being exported to China, Khurāsān and Sind.[4] In the narratives of Chau Ju-kua we read of Tién-chu (India) trading yearly with Ta-ts'in and Fu-nan[5] most likely through the land route across north-western India. From Muhammad 'Aufī we learn of a Hindu merchant named Wasa Abhir from Nahrwala who had trade agents at Ghazni. His property at Ghazni was valued ten lacs of rupees which suggests his flourishing trade. It is recorded that after his defeat at the hands of the Gujarat army Mu'izz-ud-dīn bin Sam was advised to confiscate the property of Wasa Abhir. Mu'izz-ud-dīn is said to have turned down the advice on grounds of justice. It may be suggested that Indian merchants at Ghazni must have acquired such influence and yielded such huge dues that the state did not

---

1. I.198.
2. Ibn Haukal - Elliot and Dowson I.38; Al-Idrīsī - Elliot and Dowson I.83.
3. Elliot and Dowson I.21.
4. Ibid., 92.
5. p. 111.
6. Elliot and Dowson II.200f.

dare to stop this channel of income for all times.

It would appear that a considerable number of horses imported into India came along the overland route. Among the lists of horses in Sanskrit works we find names of breeds from countries naturally connected by the land-route. Thus Bāhlika, Kāmboja and Turuṣka are mentioned by the Upamitibhavaprapañcā-kathā as the best.[1] The Abhidhānaratnamālā mentions horses from Persia, Vanāyu, Kāmboja, Bāhlika, Sindhu and the land bordering on the Sindhu as good ones.[2] From the Vaijayantī it follows that Bāhlika (Balkh) was sending not only its horses[3] but also saffron and asafoetida.[4] The same text suggests that the Ramaṭhas (living between Ghazni and Wakhan) were also known for their asafoetida.[5] The synonym kāpiśāyana for wine[6] suggests that wine from Kapiśā also came to India along the north-western route.

The frequent journeys of merchants and scholars gave Indians a good knowledge of these regions. Thus the composer of a Paramāra panegyric describing the conquests of the Paramāra king Lakṣmadeva[7] after the fashion of the digvijaya of Raghu in the Raghuvaṃśa rightly substitutes Turuṣkas for Hūṇas on the

---

1. p. 474.
2. (Aufrecht) II.284.
3. p. 111 l. 189.
4. p. 252 l. 51.
5. p. 133 l. 262.
6. (Aufrecht) II.174.
7. Bhandarkar's List, no. 170.

banks of the Vaṃksu. The Kāmbojas, Turuṣkas and the Cīnas were no less known than the Indian provinces of Trigarta, Gauḍa, Aṅga and Vaṅga.[1] In several texts of the period we find long lists of peoples living on the north-west of India. Thus the Vaijayantī[2] mentions the Cīnas or Kharaṃbharas, the Gāṃdhāras or Dihaṇḍas (Rawalpindi and Peshawar), the Yavanas or Huruṣkaras (a mistake for Turuṣkas), the Laṃpākas or Muruṇḍas (Laghman in Afghanistan), the Tokṣāras or Yugālikas (Tukharistan of the Arabs), the Ṭarkas or Bālhīkas (Balkh), the Vāhīkas or Vāhlikas (in Punjab), the Kāśmiras or Kīras, the Turuṣkas or the Śākhis (probably for the Ṣāhis) and the Sindhus or the Dāradas (Daratpuri in northern Kashmir). We find similar lists in the Kāvyamīmāṃsā[3], Abhidhānacintāmaṇi[4] and Trikāṇḍaśeṣa[5]. The list of peoples found in the Mārkaṇḍeya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Matsya and Vāmana Purāṇas and also given by Al-Bīrūnī reveals a knowledge of areas across the north-western boundaries of India. We read of the Vāhlīkas (Balkh, northern Afghanistan), Kālatoyakas (Kalat, Baluchistan), Pahlavas (Pahlavis or Persians), Carmakhaṇḍikas (Samarkand), Gandhāras (Rawalpindi and Peshawar),

---

1. Cf. Samayamātrkā, II.104.
2. p. 37 ll. 46-47, 50-54. The list is corrupt at places.
3. pp. 94, 51, 98.
4. pp. 382, 383.
5. p. 31.

Yavanas (Indo-Greeks in north-western India)[1], Pāradās (Parthians in Khorasan), Hārahūṇakas or Hārahūras (probably Hūṇas in Herat), Ramaṭhas (between Ghazni and Wakhan), Ruddhakaṭakas (Rudok, Tibet), Daśamānakas (Dasht valley, Kalat), Kāmbojas (near Badakhshan beyond the Hindu Kush), Daradas (Daratpuri in northern Kashmir), Cīnas, Tuṣāras or Tukhāras (Tukharistan of the Arabs), Prasthalas or Puṣkalas (Prang-Charsadda-Mir Ziyarat region Peshawar), Lampākas (Laghman, Afghanistan), Āvagānas (Afghans), Cūlikas (Sogdians to the north of the Oxus), Jāguḍas (southern Afghanistan), Aurasas (Urasa, Hazara), Ānibhadras (?), Kirātas (?), Tomaras (?) and Haṃsamārgas (Hunza, N.W. Kashmir)[2]. The condensed list as found in the Viṣṇu, Kūrma and Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas adds the Pārasīkas (Persians) to this list.[3] The knowledge of the Purāṇic writers about the area is further evinced by the fact that they know not only the names of the rivers Sītā (Syr Darya or Jaxartes) and Cakṣu (Vakṣu, Vaṃkṣu, Oxus or Amu Darya)[4] but also enumerates the names of the countries through which they flow.[5] In the lists in the Vaijayantī and

---

1. There were surely no Greeks in the region at this time. The term is just a conventional survival from an earlier age. The occurrence of Yavanas shows that the Purāṇas just knew vaguley of the existence of these countries and sometimes their knowledge was centuries out of date.
2. D.C.Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, pp. 23-26.
3. Ibid., p. 38.
4. Ibid., p. 58.
5. Ibid., p. 60.

the Purāṇas alike Cīna has been mentioned along with the areas across the north-western frontiers of India[1], thus giving evidence that Indians travelled to China across these regions[2]. That the Cīna of these texts was the famous country of China and not some area inhabited by a Tibeto-Chinese people[3] is clear from the fact that the Vaijayantī[4] speaking about the pāṣaṇḍas (heretical sects) which seek emancipation (mokṣāvalambinaḥ)[5] and have their distient signs (bāhyaliṅginaḥ) says that in the court ofthe emperor of China (Cīneśasaṃsadi) there are three hundred and sixty sub-sects distinguished by their peculiar garments, ways of living and doctrines (veṣājīvakṛtāntādyaiḥ). If we read the passage in association with the fact that in the Purāṇic literature of the period pāṣaṇḍa is often used exclusively for the Buddhists[6] we can see in the passage a clear reference to China.

We find that gradually the Indian merchants were losing to the Muslims a considerable part of not only of the foreign

---

1. Ibid., p. 61.
2. We have seen (supra pp.179f) that contact with China was commoner by sea in the middle ages. Perhaps the reference to China as a north-western country is based on earlier information, from sources of earlier centuries before the sea-route was developed.
3. D.C.Sircar, Studies in Geography, p. 25.
4. p. 103 ll.479f. Also Nāmamālikā, p. 27 ll.424f.
5. Obviously a reference to the nirvāṇa ideal of the Buddhists.
6. R.C.Hazra, Studies in the Upapurāṇas, I Index, s.v., pāṣaṇḍa, especially pp. 143, 147, 278, 326.

trade but also the domestic commerce incidental to it. We have evidence to show that Muslim traders were coming to India and sometimes penetrated far into the interior. We have the explicit testimony of the Kāmil-ut-Tawārīkh of Ibn Asir that there were Mussalmāns in the country of Banaras from the days of Mahmūd bin Sabuktigīn.[1] From Muhammad 'Aufī we learn that Bahrām Gūr of Iran clothing himself in the garb of a merchant came to Hindustan.[2] It is also significant that when Bakhtyār Khaljī appeared before the city of Nadiyā with only eighteen horsemen people thought that he was a trader in horses.[3] It is clear from this reference that the visit of Muslim merchants to Nadiyā must have been quite frequent so as not to create any apprehension in the local population. Traditions recorded by Tāranātha mention settlements of Turks in the Antarvedī or Gaṅgā-Yamunā doab.[4] From the same source we learn that during the time of Lavasena and his successors and prior to the invasion of Odantapurī and Vikramaśilā the number of Turks had increased in number.[5] According to the Samayamātṛkā the Muslims singing songs in the bazars was a usual feature of a city night.[6]

---

1. Elliot and Dowson II.251.
2. Ibid., II.159.
3. Ibid., II.308-9.
4. I.A., IV.366.
5. I.H.Q., XXII.240. Cf. traditions about Turkish settlers at Maner (Patna) - A.I.O.C., VI pp. 123ff.
6. III.26 - caranti mlecchagāyanāh.

Moreover, it was obviously in the wake of the merchants that Sufi saints came to India. In the eleventh and the twelfth centuries we find them at Bahraich, Ajmer, Jarua (Hajipur) and Netrokona (Mymensingh).[1] It has been rightly suggested that the far-flung campaigns of Sultān Mahmūd would have been impossible without an accurate knowledge of trade-routes and local resources of India, which he probably obtained from Muslim merchants.[2] Several Arab narratives contain accounts of the land-routes in India with minute details of the distance between the cities and of their products. It is clear that they were compiled from the information supplied by Muslim merchants who had visited these regions and were meant to serve as guides for those who were to go there in future. That these routes were in being used by Muslim merchants receives the remarkably clear testimony of Al-Bīrūnī who in describing the route across the Himalayas in the north observes that Rājāwari was the farthest place to which Muslim merchants traded, and beyond which they never passed.[3]

The Arab writers unanimously accuse the Pratihāra kings of being unfriendly towards the Arabs and Islam.[4] Political

---

1. Askari, Historical Miscellany, pp. 53ff; I.C., I.205ff; Titus, Indian Islam, p. 43.
2. M.Habib in his Introduction (p.46) to Elliot and Dowson II.
3. I.207-8.
4. Sulaimān in Elliot and Dowson, I.4; Al-Mas'ūdī in ibid., I.21.

antagonism with the Arab state could not have been sufficient to deserve such strong opinions. Other Indian states on the north-west who opposed the Muslim armies tooth and nail have not received such a censure. It may be that the Pratihāras realised the economic menace in the form of Muslim merchants flooding India. In the interests of the indigenous merchants they discouraged the influx of Muslim merchants and probably imposed checks and restrictions in furtherance of their policy. That the Pratihāra administration was highly efficient has been admitted by the Arab writers themselves.[1] It is likely that the strict attitude of the Pratihāra officers in the matter of Muslim merchants was the reason for the displeasure of Arab writers. It is to be noted that these Arab accounts were written by merchants themselves, or in any case for the guidance of the merchants. If, as has sometimes been done,[2] we interpret the term turuṣkadaṇḍa appearing in the land-grants of the Gāhaḍavālas, who succeeded to the central portion of the Pratihāras, to mean an impost upon the Muslim settlers in the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom we may say that the Gāhaḍavālas followed the policy of the Pratihāras. For many reasons the Gāhaḍavālas did not impose a total ban on the coming of the Muslim traders

---

1. Sulaimān says "There is no country in India more safe from robbers" - Elliot and Dowson, I.4.
2. See supra pp. 93-96.

but imposed a tax on them which must have provided a valuable source of income.

Prof. M.Habib[1] has suggested that the new Indian custom that the Hindus should not travel overland into countries where th e muñja grass does not grow and the black gazelles do not graze practically handed over all foreign commerce to outsiders, along with the domestic commerce incidental to it. Obviously he is basing his view on the testimony of Al-Bīrūnī.[2] But as Al-Bīrūnī himself clearly states this restriction was for the brāhmaṇas only. Again when Al-Bīrūnī observes that people say that a brāhmaṇa is not allowed to stay in a country of the above description he is referring to a theoretical restriction in the legal texts about whose practical implementation he himself appears to have had no idea. It has also to be noted that this was not a custom new to the period. We can trace it back in any case to the time of the Manusmṛti.[3] We must confess that in the present state of our knowledge we cannot lay hands on any specific reason for the objection to crossing the borders of Āryāvarta. It may however be suggested that the prevailing political chaos had something to do with it.

---

1. Introduction (p.46) to Elliot and Dowson II.
2. II.134f.
3. II.23-Kṛṣṇasārastu carati mṛgo yatra svabhāvataḥ.
Sa jñeyo yajñiyo deśo mlecchadeśastvataḥ parah.

CHAPTER VIII - FOREIGN TRADE (B) SEA ROUTE

The history of India's sea-trade in the early medieval period has to be studeid in a wider context. It is only a link in the trade activities throughout the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean in which many nations from Africa to China were participating. Before our period of study this oceanick trade was shared by the Persians, Indians, Indonesians and Ceylonese. Gradually however the share of the Persians was increasing. But with the coming of Islam on the scene we find the Arabs replacing the Persians. At first the Arabs interested themselves in sea raids[1], but the conquest of Sind, soon after 710 A.D., gave them an opening towards the east.[2] The year 758 is remarkable in this history. The number of the Arabs (Ta-shih) and the Persians (Po-sse)[3] had grown so large that they could sack and

---

1. Hourani, Arab seafaring, pp.53-55.
2. Ibid., p.63.
3. Hadi Hasan and following him Hourani and others refer all accounts of Po-sse to Persia. Sinologists however headed by T.Kumaso, B.Laufer and G.E.Gerini hold that there existed another country and people of the same name, and always written in a like manner, the location of which is referred to the Southern Ocean, and which must have belonged to the Malayan group. A third group of scholars including R.Braddell, K.Yamada and Gibson-Hill admit Po-sse to be a transcription of Parsa or Persia, but believes that Chinese authors sometimes mistook the provenance of commodities which they ascribed to that country. P.Wheatley holds that the name, though applied by the Chinese originally to Persia, became increasingly associated with products which found their way to China along the southern sea route, so that by T'ang and Sung times the old association of the name with the Middle Eastern

(Continued

burn the city of Canton.[1] But this is the last occasion when the Po-sse are mentioned in Chinese accounts. Instead we find the Ta-shih as thermost important foreign community.

It was the simultaneous existence of the Umayyad caliphs in the western world and of the T'ang dynasty in China which fostered this trade.[2] Its growing importance explains the rather fuller accounts of the southern Asia in the Chinese annals of the sixth and seventh centuries. The earliest Chinese testimony for this trade comes from the eighth century. It was in 607 that the Chinese emperor sent a mission by sea to open commercial relations with Chi-tu (Siam). The nascent Chinese seamanship regarded even this an unusually daring voyage.[3] However the itineraries compiled by Kia Tan between 785 and 805 indicate that the Chinese had no first hand information of the sea-route between Canton and the Persian Gulf, especially to the west of Quilon.[4] The Chinese were slow to participate actively in this lucrative sea-trade. The Arab geographers, no doubt, refers to

---

Continued)
country had been forgotten and it came to stand as a collective name for the countries of the South Seas and the Indian Ocean, with the exception of India and later on seems gradually to have become identified with an unspecified realm in that part of the world-J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXII, Pt.2 (1959), pp.14

1. Hasan, Persian Navigation, p.99.
2. Hourani, Op.cit., pp.61-62.
3. Chau Ju-kua, pp.7-8.
4. Ibid., pp.9-10.

the presence of ships of China (marākib al-Ṣīn) and Chinese ships (sufun Sinīyah) even up to Aden. But these refer to the ships in the China trade, which, even if constructed in China, were not owned and navigated by the Chinese. The Chinese were ignorant even of the names of Aden and Siraf down to the close of the twelfth centrury.[1]

The sack of Canton directed trade to Tongking for some time; but Canton was re-opened in 792. The flourishing trade in the period is reflected in the extensive contemporary literature on navigation.[2] The period witnessed the growth of Ts'üan-chou, near Amoy, as another entrepot of the sea-trade.[3] However the Arab sources, though indicating a knowledge of Korea and Japan, do not suggest that the Arab traders visited them.[4] The climax appears to have been reached when the political disturbances in China in 878 brought the sea-trade to an abrupt end. Abū Zaid tries to account for the interruption of the trade with China and refers to the oppression of the merchants and sailors and to the political disunity of the Chinese empire.[5] It must, how-

---

1. Cf. Hourani, Op. cit., pp.75-76 for the passage of Al-Mas'ūdi. See also Chau Ju-kua, p.15 f.n.3; Cathay and the Way Thither, I p.87.
2. Hourani, Op.cit., pp.65-66.
3. Chau Ju-kua, pp.17-18.
4. Ibid., p.168 f.n.1; p.172 f.n.1.
5. Ancient Accounts of India and China, pp.40ff.

ever, the remembered that the decline of the T'ang dynasty was accompanied by a parallel dismemberment of the Abbasid empire.[1]

The centre of trade now shifted to the port of Kedah on the west coast of the Malaya peninsula to which came ships both from China and the Arabic world. The importance of the Indonesian empire in this trade is testified to by Arab narratives of the tenth century.[2]

It would however appear that towards the close of the tenth century Canton and Ts'üan-chóu had revived. The trade was becoming important to the Chinese state which converted it into a monopoly and sent trade missions abroad, offering special privileges to the foreign traders coming to China. All this effort resulted in a phenomenal increase in the volume of trade which is also reflected in the measures the government took to regulate and control it.[3] However, even in the twelfth century we find that the Chinese were content to leave the actual trade in the seas to Arab and other foreign traders.[4] Later the Southern Sung Dynasty made Hangchow, one of the important centres of navigation, its capital, and this indicated its sea-minded policy.[5] Chinese maritime enterprise appears to have reached a high peak

---

1. Hourani, Op. cit., pp.77-78.
2. R.C.Majumdar, Suvarnadvīpa, II.30.
3. Chau Ju-kua, pp.18-20.
4. Ibid., p.22.
5. J.J.L.Duyvendak, China's Discovery of Africa, p.15.

controlling the sea-routes to the south-east and India.[1] Under Kublai Khan the Chinese participation in the sea-trade received a further fillip by his active encouragement. The Arab monopoly of the trade in the south seas must have received a set back from the expansion of the Chinese traders. It is not without significance that the Arab geographical literature after the tenth centrury is not so abundant as in the earlier period; without any newness in its treatment it merely repeats the existing information.[2] The process must have been gradual indeed, but by the time of Ibn Batūta the Chinese appear to have established themselves strongly in the sea-route up to Calicut and other Malabar ports.[3]

Thus we see that the role of India in the sea-trade of the period was conditioned by the existence and gradual progress of rivals in different areas and periods. To start with the Arabs were the foremost maritime power, pushing the limits of their economic influence slowly and gradually towards the east. By the middle of the ninth century they had established themselves as the master partner in this trade and we find that even in subsequent centruries, when powerful contenders had arisen, the Arabs did retain a considerable part of this trade

---

1. K.S.Latourette, The Chinese, p.237.
2. Hourani, Op. cit., p.83.
3. Ibid.

in all the areas. However, from the tenth century they had to yield a part of the monopoly, especially to the west of the Indonesian countries, to the ports of Sumatra, and Java and Malaya. From the twelfth century they had to face a strong rival in the Chinese who eventually succeeded in establishing their commercial hegemony right up to the Malabar ports.

Much of the credit for this remarkable expansion of Arab enterprise has to be ascribed to the flood of force released by the new religion of Islam.[1] The prestige of a merchant in Islam may be connected even with the fact that Muhammad himself was a merchant in his early life.[2] The Arabs, owing to the geographical conditions of the country and its situation, have, from very early times, enjoyed a prominent part of the sea-trade between the east and the west.[3] Moreover, the development would not appear to have been altogether new in the sense that Islam, by assimilating the Persians, was actually stepping into the shoes of the Persian seamen who in those times had succeeded in carving out a high position for themselves in the field of maritime trade.[4] The political unity of western Asia resulting from the expansion of Islam and the Arabs, which brought the Persian

---

1. Hourani, Op. cit., p.53.
2. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.20.
3. Chau Ju-kua, p.4.
4. Hourani, Op. cit., pp.65-66.

Gulf and the Red Sea under one power, an ideal which had been the despair of all the earlier empires in the area, had also an important influence on the expansion of Arab maritime enterprise.[1] By uniting western Asia and Egypt they were able to control all the sea-routes going towards India and other eastern countries and achieved what even the Achaemenids could not. Though precise details are lacking, it is also likely that the Umayyad period saw some improvements in the construction of Arab ships.[2] In one Chinese account we have a reference to foreign ships "so high out of water that ladders several tens of feet in length had to be used to get aboard".[3] From the prominence of the Arabs as the foreign traders coming to China we can, with fair plausibility, utilise the reference for the Arab ships of the period.

However, according to the Chinese testimony even in the middle of the T'ang period, the largest foreign ships were those of the Ceylonese people.[4] Ceylon had another basic advantage. The position of monsoon made direct communications between Ceylon and the Malay straits possible from a very early time. Even in the time of Fa-hsien one had to come from Tāmralipti to

---

1. Ibid., p.53.
2. Motīcandra, Sārthavāha, p.202.
3. Chau Ju-kua, p.9.
4. J.N.B.R.A.S., XXXI Part 2, p.106.

Ceylon in order to sail for Sumatra.[1] This continued to be the case even when I-tsing visited India.[2] Cosmas testifies to the central position of Ceylon in the transit trade between the east and the west.[3] A story in the Jain text Samarāiccakahā also records that from Śrīpura in Suvarṇabhūmi vessels sailed for Sīhaladvīpa daily.[4]

The Chinese, who appear to have been the last to enter the arena, gradually outdid all other competitors in the field. The Chinese ships were decidedly better, bigger and safer than the others. It was, therefore, quite natural that people preferred to sail in Chinese ships. The Chinese ships were ~~xxxxxxx~~ broad and almost square, and had a narrow keel. Their masts numbered between four and six and had sometimes as many as twelve sails. The ships are said to have had four decks and were divided into water-tight compartments. Besides 600 men as passengers the ships had 400 armed men to fight against pirates.[5] Moreover, the Chinese ships appear to have had larger and better rigged sails than those of the Arabs.[6] Towards the close of the eleventh century the Chinese are found using the mariner's compass, though, to start with, the sailors still mostly relied

---

1. (Legge) p.100.
2. pp. xxv, xxxiv.
3. Christian Topography, p.365.
4. pp.327-28.
5. J.J.L.Duyvendak, China's Discovery of Africa, p.18; H.A.R. Gibb, Ibn Batūta, p.235.
6. J.Poujade, La Route des Indes et ses Navires, p.162.

on winds, sun and stars to guide the course of their ships.[1] During the course of centuries the Chinese improved and expanded their knowledge of overseas countries, gradually progressing towards the west.[2] Moreover the Chinese empire also actively encouraged and promoted Chinese maritime enterprise. The start made by the Southern Sung Dynasty was followed up with remarkable results by Kublai Khan.

Indonesia enjoyed a natural advantage from its central position. Contacts with different foreigners were probably utilised in improving the art of shipping. We get the impression from a story in the Kathākosa[3] that the interests of the Indonesian shipping were actively watched and protected by the state. In this story Sundara the king of Suvarṇadvīpa on hearing of the ships of Nāgadatta having fallen into the hollow of a snake-circled mountain sends a sailor to help them. Even if the story narrated by Abū Zaid about the Mahārāja of Zābaj (Java) attacking the kingdom of Kumar (Khmer) be of a doubtful historicity it does indicate the high prestige enjoyed by Java in the estimation of the people in that period.[4]

It would appear, on the other hand, that "Indian techniques

---

1. Chau Ju-kua, pp.20, 34.
2. Ibid., Introduction.
3. (Tawney) pp.28-29.
4. Elliot and Dowson, I.8f.

of ship construction and navigation had by this time fallen behind those of the Arabs and Chinese".[1] The relative insignificance of Indian shipping explains the absence of any reference to it in the Chinese and Arab accounts.[2] There are indications to suggest that the Indian ships were smaller than those of China. Thus for example the Ling-wai Tai-ta (A.D. 1178) observes that the Chinese treders with big ships who wish to go to the country of the Arabs, must tranship at Ku-lin (Quilon) to smaller boats before proceeding further.[3] Moreover, we have the clear testimony of Marco Polo[4] who describes the ships of Manzi, or S. China, as larger than those of India. Again the Indian ships lagged behind the Chinese and Arab ones in the matter of speed. Thus Chau Ju-kua states that from San-fo-ts'i (Palembang, E.Sumatra) Nan-p'i (Malabar) is a little more than a month's voyage.[5] Else-

---

1. A.L.Basham, Arts and Letters, XXIII p.69.
2. The suggestion that the Arabs and Chinese might have regarded Indian shipping and Sumatran and Javanese shipping as the same, as they viewed Sumatra and Java as parts of India (Motichandra, Op. cit., p.207), is not strong. Both these sources refer to India and Sumatra and Java separately and in the same context. Though they felt that Sumatra and Java were for all purposes a continuation of India they realised its separate existence. Moreover these sources are found referring not only to the different parts of India but also of Sumatra and Java. If there is any validity in the suggestion the use of the term Indian in place of Sumatran and Javan shipping would have been more appropriate.
3. Chau Ju-kua, p.91 f.n.17.
4. Yule II p.391 n; A.L.Basham, Loc. cit., p.69.
5. p. 87.

where he says that it takes a Ts'üan-chŏu ship a month to reach Ku-lin (Quilon) from Lan-li (extreme N.W. coast of Sumatra).[1] Likewise the Akhbār of Sulaimān gives one month as the time taken to reach Kalah Bār (Kedah) from Kūlam Mali (Quilon).[2] It is therefore significant in this connection to find the Samarā-iccakahā stating that the ship sailing from Tāmralipti reached Suvarṇabhūmi in two months.[3] Even if we make due allowance for the great exaggeration in all that has come down to us concerning the embassy to China sent by the king of Chu-lién (Cola),[4] we can have an idea of the slow speed of Indian ships from the fact that the journey took the mission 1150 days[5] out of which it was under sail for only 247 days. From Chau Ju-kua[6] it would appear that the Ta-shih (Arabs) took some hundred days to reach their own country from Ts'üan-chóu. The Akhbār of Sulaimān seems to corroborate it when it gives a 120 days as the time for the voyage from Masqat to Canton.[7]

Another reason for the declining condition of Indian shipping might have been the apathy and inability of the Indian states to protect its interests. In the earlier period we find

---

1. Ibid., pp.89.
2. Hourani, Arab seafaring, p.75.
3. p.327.
4. Chau Ju-kua, p.101 n.11.
5. Ibid., p.99 n.3.
6. Ibid., p.114.
7. Hourani, Op. cit., p.75.

the state actively participating in the sea-trade. The Artha-śāstra[1] mentions state owned vessels which were lent out to merchants and were used for carrying passengers and merchandise. A remarkable confirmation of this is to be found in Megasthenes,[2] who records that the Indian ship-builders were salaried public servants and that ships built in the royal yards were hired to voyagers and merchants. A Jātaka[3] story also refers to sailors as being in the king's service. The Periplus[4] speaks of native fishermen in the king's service, stationed at the entrances of the western ports in well-manned large boats going up the coast as far as Syrastrene, from which they pilot vessels to Barygaza. These men in the pilot service of the state are referred to as sāgara-paloganānam in a Kanheri inscription.[5] The Sātavāhana policy of actively promoting and regulating shipping is reflected in the ship coins of Śrī Yajña Śātakarṇi.[6] This policy was followed by the Pallavas and Kuruṃvara kings some of whose coins resemble these Sātavāhana coins.[7] This aspect of Indian polity

---

1. II.28.
2. McCrindle, Ancient India as described in Classical literature, p.53.
3. No. 539. I owe this reference to Mr. B.N.Mukerji.
4. 44.
5. P.I.H.C., 1960, pp.55-57.
6. Rapson, Coins of the Andhra dynasty, pp.22f; J.N.S.I., III pp.43-45. Cf. the title trisamudrādhipati in the Harsacarita, p.224 and Cape Andrai Satimoundon in Ptolemy VII.4.3.
7. Elliot, Coins of Southern India, p.35 Plate I.38.

continued to be important even up to the early years of the seventh century when Bhāskaravarman, the king of Assam, is found owning 30,000 ships.[1] In the period under study it would appear that the coastal powers often resorted to piracy. Owing to the growth of feudalism the states were generally small in size and power and thus might have found active promotion of shipping beyond their means. Piracy would have appeared more lucrative than actual participation in sea-trade, especially in view of the meagre resources of the state. The growing maritime power of the Arabs also probably led these states to realise the futility of competing with them. Even about 636 the governor of Al-Baḥrayan had raided Thana near Bombay and also the Bay of Daybul at the mouth of the Indus.[2] The conquest of Sind also indicated the maritime superiority of the Arabs. This became more apparent when Muhammad Ghūrī scored a decisive victory in his naval war with the Jats.[3]

In the Daśakumāracarita[4] we have a definite reference to a piratical expedition undertaken by the prince of Tāmralipti, who with a fleet consisting of one large vessel and several smaller boats swarmed round a Yavana ship. In the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[5]

---

1. The Life, pp.171f; Watters I.348. The number seems to be exaggerated.
2. Islamic Culture, XX p.55.
3. Elliot and Dowson, II.478.
4. (Tr. Ryder) p.164.
5. p.14.

we read of the three princes of king Yogarāja looting near the port of Someśvara a ship belonging to another country. Significantly enough king Yogarāja in this connection refers to the bad name which some of his predecessor kings had earned and observes that kings of other countries brand the state of Gurjara as that of robbers. A strikingly close parallel is to be found in the Motupalli Pillar Inscription[1] in which the Kākatīya king Ganapatideva claims that former kings forcibly took away the wares of ships voyaging from one country to another which were wrecked, driven ashore or forced to touch at a place that was not meant as a port of call, owing to unfavourable winds. Ibn Batūta[2] also testifies to the royal support for piratical activities.[3]

---

1. E.I., XII p.195.
2. (Tr. H.A.R.Gibb) pp.233, 254.
3. In this context it may be suggested that at times the unnecessarily stringent rules and practices of the custom officers, which were vexatious to foreigners, were labelled as piracy. Cf. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.479 f.n.56. From the Mānasollāsa (II p.62 vv.374-76) it appears that the coastal states had adopted some kind of a license system and enforced it strictly. The boats of sailors residing in the country had to pay one-tenth of their cargo as duty on returning to the harbour; whereas in case of foreign boats driven to the harbour by an unfavourable wind the king was to confiscate all the merchandise or to allow the merchant to keep a little. Thus confiscation of unlicensed ships was quite within the laws of the Indian states. In the Motupalli Pillar Inscription (loc. cit.) also the ships which are said to have been confiscated would appear to have been those without license. This receives support from the fact that the inscription records that as opposed to the existing practice king Ganapatideva issued a charter of security (abhaya-śāsana) and fixed the customs to be paid. It is to be noted that in the

(Continued

In this period piracy would appear to have increased. No doubt references to piracy are found from early times. But whereas previously it was confined to small areas, it had now become quite widespread. A number of sources clearly indicate that great pirate ships called bīra were molesting sailors and merchants from the Gulf of Cutch to the coasts of Ceylon, the mouth of the Tigris and the southern part of the Red Sea and occasionally also to Zanzibar.[1] The dangerous activities of the pirates are found not only near the Andamans[2] but also in Indonesian waters.[3] In the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[4] we have a reference to merchants out of fear for the pirates (jalacora) hiding gold slabs in sacks of mañjiṣṭhā. In the graphic description in the Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[5] of preparations being made before the ship set sail we have a definite reference that war preparations,

---

Continued)
Prabandhacintāmaṇi (p.14) also the sons of king Yogarāja are said to have looted the ship of another king which driven by storms, had come to the port of Someśvara and was passing through their country, clearly without previous permission.

1. Al-Bīrūnī I.208; Marco Polo (Yule) II.389; ~~Tabari III.458;~~ Ibn Batūta, Voyages(ed. C.Defremery and B.R.Sangiunetti) IV. 59f; A History of the Imams and Sayyids of Oman, pp.12-13.
2. Cf. Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā of Kṣemendra, pp.113f.
3. Chau Ju-kua, pp.84, 85.
4. p.70 ll.2ff.
5. pp.870-72 - vidhīyate raṇasāmagrī.

obviously for protecting the ship from the pirates, were made. Piracy must have deterred Indian merchants from resorting to frequent voyages to distant areas. We have a significant reference in the Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā[1] that some traders vexed by the piracy committed by the Nāgas, most probably the inhabitants of Andaman and Nicobar, were contemplating to leave trade for some other occupation. This may reflect the prevailing attitude of the sea-traders of India in that age. The Indian merchants do not appear to have done much by way of providing for the safety of their ships. It is not without significance that whereas references for the Arab[2] and Chinese[3] ships being manned with soldiers are forthcoming, we have not much to suggest this for their Indian counterparts.[4] It is difficult to account for this apathy on the part of Indian traders. It might have been due to the essentially peaceful nature and upbringing of a vaiśya. Significantly enough we do not have many references to the interest of a vaiśya in military pursuits and warlike activities. We cannot say how far Jainism was the underlying reason for this. It may however be noticed from the early Buddhist literature and inscriptions that in earlier times Buddhism was quite popular among merchants. The early medieval period was

---

1. pp.113-14.
2. Ibn Batūta (H.A.R.Gibb) p.230.
3. Ibn Batūta, Voyages, III.88-91
4. Contra see Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā, pp.870-72.

apparently one of decline for Buddhism. Instead we find Jainism flourishing among the merchants near the coast. In some of the Jain stories of the period we find enterprising young merchants being discouraged from resorting to sea-trade.[1] We do not know how much of this attitude was due to the Jain faith.

However, it has to be noted that there had grown in this period a definite taboo against sea-voyages in the orthodox Brahmanical group. Thus the Bṛhannāradīya includes the undertaking of sea-voyage (samudra-yātrā-svīkāraḥ) in its list of practices which, being unfavourable for the attainment of heaven and disliked by the people, have been forbidden for the Kali age.[2] Underlying this restriction must have been the feeling that on a ship one cannot observe his religious rites and rituals in all their meticulous details, especially as regards ceremonial purity. After the advent of Muslims the need for such restrictions would have been felt all the more. It has been suggested that the intensification of religious prejudices was the expression of the decay of Indian maritime activity due to practical and economic reasons.[3] P.V.Kane[4] interprets the relevant passages to show that the prohibition against sea-voyage affected only brāhmaṇas and even then they did not apparently become altogether

---

1. Cf. Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā, p.867.
2. XXII.12-16. See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III p.928 for other references.
3. A.L.Basham, Op. cit., p.69.
4. Op. cit., p.934.

unfit to be associated with. But what cannot be denied is that there was a definite disparagement of sea-voyages especially for merchants.[1]

That there had been a definite decline in the shipping activity of the Indians is undoubted. At any rate it had ceased to be of much significance to some of the thinkers of northern India such as Medhātithi and Lakṣmīdhara, who were undoubtedly not associated with coastal areas. Manu[2] had laid down that the interest to be paid is to be fixed by persons expert in sea-voyages and those capable of calculating the profits in connection with a particular place and time. Commenting on this Medhātithi observes that the sea-voyage has been mentioned only by way of illustrating a journey; the sense is that whatever interest is fixed by traders, who know all about journeying by land and water, it should be determined as the exact amount to be paid. Lakṣmīdhara also explains the expression 'experts in sea-voyages' to refer by implication to the merchants in general.[3]

x x x x x x x

The journeys of the Buddhists between China and India provide a convenient background for the understanding of the commercial intercourse between the two countries. The eighth century

---

1. Cf. Vyavahāramayūkha referred to in Kane, Op. cit., p.936.
2. VIII.157.
3. Kṛtyakalpataru, Vyavahāra, p.284.

witnessed the close of the most brisk period of Sino-Indian intercourse. Relations were revived under the Sung dynasty to such an extent that the Chinese chronicles themselves hold the number of Indian monks in the Chinese court towards the close of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century as the highest in Chinese history. But soon the climax would appear to have been reached, the date A.D. 1036 marking the close of the period of active Sino-Indian intercourse.[1]

A Chinese account of 749 refers to the Canton river as full of vessels from India, Persia and Arabia and says that in Canton itself there were three Brāhmaṇa temples where Indian Brāhmaṇas lived.[2] The presence of Indians in the Chinese see can be inferred from two Japanese records which give the credit of introducing cotton into Japan to two Indians carried over to that country by the black current.[3]

Embassies to China sent by Indian states do not appear to have been motivated by simple political considerations but probably cared for commercial gains also. Tiên-chu or eastern India is recorded to have sent envoys to the T'ang court in 627-650 and 690-692 A.D.[4] In 656-658 a number of Indian states,

---

1. Age of Imperial Kanauj, pp.443-444.
2. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.19.
3. R.K.Mookerji, History of Indian Shipping, p.174.
4. Chau Ju-kua, p.111.

Chan-po (Campāpura), Kan-chih-fo (Kāñcīpura), Shih-li-chün (perhaps the kingdom of the Cālukyas) and Mo-la (Malaya in S. India ?), are found reopening official relations with China obviously in recognition of the new possibilities of the Chinese trade.[1] It was in view of the increasing number of embassies to China that an imperial edict of 695 determined the provisions to be supplied to the ambassadors of different countries. The ambassadors of north India and south India were to receive provisions for six months.[2] Chinese accounts preserve notices of embassies to China sent by Śīlāditya of Western India and the Cālukya Vallabha of South India in 692 and the Pallava king Narasiṃhavarman II Rājasiṃha in 720.[3]

We have the testimony of Al-Mas'ūdī to show that ships from India along with those from Basra, Siraf, Oman, Java and Campā ascended the Khanfu river to reach Khanfu (Canton).[4] We learn from Sulaimān[5] and Al-Mas'ūdī[6] that the kingdom of Rahma (Bengal) was exporting to China horns of rhinoceros to be made into fashionable and costly girdles. In the Jain text Samarāiccakahā[7]

---

1. J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXX part 2, pp.74-75.
2. B.E.F.E.O., IV p.334.
3. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, pp.16-17.
4. q. in Ages of Imperial Kanauj, p.401.
5. Ferrand, Textes, p.44.
6. Ibid., p.105.
7. VI p.39.

we read of a sailor Suvadana coming from China and proceeding to Devapura via Suvarṇadvīpa. Sulaimān observes that whereas other ships calling at Kaucamali (Quilon) had to pay from one dīnār to ten, the Arab ships sailing for China were required to pay one thousand dirhams.[1] It would appear from this significant reference that India had not been completely ousted by the commercial rivalry then raging. The king who possessed Quilon probably aimed at safeguarding the interests of his own native sailors and merchants by differential tariff rates. It is in this light that we have to interpret Chau Ju-kua when he observes about the Chu-lién (Cola) country that as the taxes and imposts of the kingdom are numerous and heavy, traders rarely go there.[2]

It appears that India's share in the trade with China was gradually dwindling probably because of the competition of Arab and Indonesian merchants. India is not mentioned among the countries which according to the Sung Annals were trading at Canton in 971.[3] The Liang-shu does not include China in the list of countries with which central T'ién-chu had much sea-trade.[4] Obviously sea-trade with China had ceased to be an important item in India's sea-trade activities. It is significant that Chou K'ü-feï in his list of countries exporting a considerable

---

1. Renaudot, Ancient Accounts of India and China, p.9.
2. p.95.
3. Chau Ju-kua, p.19.
4. Ibid., p.113 ll.41f.

amount of merchandise enumerates in order Arabia (Ta-shï), Java (Shö-p'o) and Palembang (San-fo-ts'i) but does not mention India. It is not unlikely that India along with many others belonged to the next rank referred to by Chou K'ü-feï.[1] But Indian states, especially of the South, occasionally tried to assert themselves. Chau Ju-kua records that in 984-988 there arrived in China by sea a priest who was a native of T'ién-chu. The fact that foreign traders, considering that he was a foreign priest, are said to have vied with each other in honouring him with presents[2] would suggest the presence of some Indian merchants. The Sung-shi, however, refers to the arrival, in the same period, of an Indian priest whose native land was Li-tö (Lāṭa).[3] In his inscriptions the Cola king Rājendra I claims to have captured among other places Kaḍāram (Kedah), Śrīvijaya (Palembang), Mānakkavaram (the Nicobar islands), Malaiyur (Djambi), Pannai (North Sumatra) and Māppappāla (uncertain but probably S. Burma).[4] It has been suggested by K.A.N.Sastri that this remarkable expedition aimed at keeping open the trade route to China threatened by the growing power of the kingdom of Śrīvijaya.[5] The recently

---

1. Ibid., p.23. It should be observed that the term hu rendered "foreign" though usually designating the people of Western Asia is sometimes applied to Indians-ibid., p.114 n.5.
2. Ibid., p.111.
3. Ibid., p.112 ll.39ff.
4. The Colas, I pp.254ff.
5. Ibid., p.267.

discovered inscription from Tanjore[1] dated in the seventh year of the reign of Rājendra (A.D. 1019) refers to the endowments in terms of Chinese gold made by a certain merchant described as an agent of Kiḍāratteraiyar. It is clear that the Cola kingdom was right there participating in the lucrative trade with China obviously through the intervention of Kiḍāra or the empire of the Śailendras. The Cola empire must have realised the possibilities of this trade if they could have an upper hand on the sea-route. The embassy which Rājendra sent to China in 1033[2] was undertaken probably with a view to improve relations ~~ex~~ with the state on the other end of the route. It would appear that this commercial policy had been initiated by Rājarāja I but he could not carry it to its successful end. We know that he had built up the Cola navy and had started making naval conquests.[3] This receives support from the fact that the Cola embassy to China in 1015 is said to have been under Lo-tsa-lo-tsa (Rājarāja).[4] The subsequent kings of the Cola dyansty appear to have followed this policy though not so successfully as Rājendra I. We hear of a Cola embassy to China in 1077.[5] The reference to the conver-

---

1. J.N.S.I., XX.13.
2. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.26.
3. The Colas, I pp.
4. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.26.
5. Ibid.

sion of a Cola prince to Buddhism in an inscription from Prome belonging to the period 1084-1112[1] also suggests that the Colas were interested in maintaining maritime contacts with countries to the east. Stray references indicate that other parts of India from time to time also made attempts to improve relations with China. Thus the Sung-shï says that in 1094 people from Mau-li (Mo-lai, Kulam Malé or Quilon) brought presents to the Chinese court.[2] Ma Tuan-lin also refers to the arrival of two Malayalis in China.[3] Envoys from sundry kings of India, including one from Kulang (Quilon), are said to have arrived in China in 1282.[4] In 1286 T'swan chau received vessels from more than 90 foreign states, among which are several names belonging to southern and western India.[5] Fifteen coins discovered at Tanjore representing almost the entire Sung period[6] go a long way to show that the Arabs had not been successful in wresting from India, especially its southern parts, its share of the Chinese trade however it might have dwindled. Significantly enough we find the Chinese government attempting in 1296 to prohibit the export of gold and silver and to limit the value of the trade with

---

1. Ibid.
2. Chau Ju-kua, p.124 n.26.
3. Ibid., p.90 n.9.
4. J.R.G.S., XLIV p.107.
5. Ibid.
6. S.I.S., I.164.

Ma'bar (Coromandel), Kulam (Quilon) and Fandaraina (Pantalāyini Kollam) to a relatively small sum of money.[1]

It would however appear that the activities of Indian sailors and merchants extended in the east mostly only to Indonesia. For this we have the express testimony of both Chinese[2] and Arab[3] sources which mention the ports of Malaya, Java or Sumatra as the farthest limit for ships coming from the west. It may be that these sources which generally think in terms of trade relations between the extreme eastern and western limits of the sea-route failed to take any notice of Indian shipping because of its more or less limited role. But it would be wrong to say that we do not have any foreign testimony to India's maritime relations with Indonesia. We have the unequivocal reference in the Liang-shu which states that central T'ien-chu had much sea-trade among other countries with Fu-nan, Jĭ-nan and Kiau-chĭ (i.e., Indo-China generally).[4] This is corroborated by the recently discovered inscription from Tanjore[5], mentioned already, which speaks of the endowments to a temple at Nāgapaṭṭinam made by a certain Śrī Kuruttan Keśuvan alias Agralekai who was an

---

1. T'oung Pao, XV pp.425f.
2. Chau Ju-kua, p.18. See also ibid., p.24 for the testimony of Chóu K'ŭ-fei.
3. See Al-Mas'ūdī, Murūj, Vol. I p.308 q. by Hourani, Op. cit., pp.75f.
4. Chau Ju-kua, p.113 ll.41-42.
5. J.N.S.I., XX.13.

agent of Kiḍārattaraiyar (the region of Kedah, Malaya).

There must have been frequent voyages of Indian merchants to the Indonesian lands[1] to have found repeated references in the story books of the period. These texts indicate an improved knowledge of the geography of the area. Thus Kṣemendra in his Rāmāyaṇamañjarī substitutes for the vague reference in the Rāmāyaṇa a clear mention of Samudradvīpa which obviously has corrupted into the name Sumatra.[2] The Samarāiccakahā speaks of Indian merchants going to Mahākaṭāha.[3] From a story in the same text it appears that often merchants used to visit Suvarṇabhūmi for trade.[4] In the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī we read of merchants going to Katākṣadvīpa,[5] obviously the same as Kaṭāhadvīpa of other references. Stories of merchants going to Suvarṇadvīpa are to be found in the Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha[6] and the Kathākoṣa[7] also. The Bṛhatkathākośa of Hariṣeṇa has references to merchants proceeding to Suvarṇadvīpa[8] and Ratnadvīpa.[9] The Kathāsaritsāgara is full of stories about trading voyages to Suvarṇadvīpa and

---

1. Cf. Tilakamañjarī, p.127-Gṛhītapracurasārabhāṇḍairbhūriśaḥ kṛtadvīpāntarayātraiḥ sahakāribhiranekaiḥ samyātrikaiḥ....
2. R.C.Majumdar, Suvarṇadvīpa, I.54-55.
3. pp.264ff, 585.
4. Ibid., pp.398ff.
5. II.183.
6. XVIII.428.
7. p.29.
8. LIII.3ff; LXXXII.1ff.
9. LXXVIII.42.

Kaṭāha of which the most significant is that of a father who in search of his lost son and younger sister follows a merchant to Nārikeladvīpa, Kaṭāhadvīpa, Karpūradvīpa, Suvarṇadvīpa and Siṃhala-dvīpa.[1] But the most interesting of all these is the Tilakamañjarī which describes a naval attack on Dvīpāntara. The descriptions given in this connection are so graphic and realistic as regards the culture and industrial products of the region[2] that they imply a thorough and intimate, if not first-hand, knowledge of these areas. Thus we see that in all the literary texts of the period the sea-trade of a merchant leads to Suvarṇadvīpa, Kaṭāha, Dvīpāntara or Ratnapura. The increasing volume and importance of this trade can very well be realised from the fact that a teacher in Vārāṇasī could have fruits brought from Dvīpāntara.[3] The Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[4] would imply that, besides trade, sight-seeing was another reason for people coming to these islands. The visitors used to take a keen interest in seeing forests, monasteries, gardens and pain-

---

1. R.C.Majumdar, Suvarnadvīpa, I pp.37-38, 51-52. It is however to be recognised that of the above-mentioned works Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha and Kathāsaritsāgara were based on the Bṛhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya. As it is difficult to be sure about the additions made by these in the original story we cannot dogmatise about the date to which any reference in these texts applies.
2. pp.133ff.
3. Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa, p.19 l.23.
4. pp.996-98 - ...na ca tasyāsti kānanādau kutūhalam....vihārārāmacaitrādidarśane ca mahattamaṃ kutūhalam. Cf. Bhaviṣyatīkahā, LIII.3-4.

tings etc. It was the growing familiarity with the Indonesian lands that led Rājaśekhara to observe that in describing things of Dvīpāntara one should be faithful to its dress, customs and other details.[1] Elsewhere he mentions sojourn in these islands as a qualification of literary men.[2] But at the same time he observes that the poets should not refer too much to the countries and their mountains and rivers lest they become difficult for the ignorant reader to follow.[2a] We have many indications to suggest that accurate geographical knowledge of the Indonesian lands, resulting from close maritime connections with them, was not confined to the merchants or sailors but was quite widespread. Thus the Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa[3] notes the peculiar features of the language in the islands of Karmaraṅga, Nāḍikera, Vāruṣaka (Baros, Sumatra), Nagna (Naked or Nicobar), Vāli (Bali) and Yava (Java). The Purāṇic list of places also includes Pravijaya (Śrīvijaya) which may be identified with modern Palembang in Sumatra.[4] Likewise some of the names in the list of islands found in the Purāṇas can be identified with places in or near Indonesia.[5] It is significant to note that most of these names

---

1. Kāvyamīmāṃsā, p.10.
2. Ibid., p.78.
2a. Ibid., p.94.
3. (ed. T.Ganapati Sastri) p.332.
4. D.C.Sircar, Studies in Geography, p.28.
5. S.N.Majumdar, Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, pp. 752-54; I.A., 1930, pp.204ff; V.S.Agrawala, Kādambarī, p.256 f.n.1 and Harṣacarita, p.169.

are used by Arab travellers to mean islands in the Archipelago.[1] It was the knowledge of the compilers of the Vāmana[2] and Garuḍa[3] Purāṇas about the definite existence of Kaṭāha and Simhala that led them to substitute these names for the words Saumya and Gandharva in the other Purāṇas. The most significant evidence comes from the Vaijayantī which gives a list of six small islands (anudvīpas) which can all be located in this region.[4] Thus Aṅga-dvīpa is the Angadiya of the Arab accounts mentioned immediately after a place on the Siamese coast and located in the Bay of Bengal.[5] Yavadvīpa would obviously refer to Java. It is however not unlikely that Yavadvīpa is a mistake for Yamadvīpa or Yama-koṭi which Al-Bīrūnī places 90° to the east of Laṅkā.[6] Malaya-dvīpa may be the Malay Peninsula. Śaṅkhadvīpa is the same as the island of Sankhaj which according to Arab writers was a part of the empire of Śrīvijaya and was three days voyage from Malaya.[7] Kuśadvīpa cannot be identified yet. But Varāhadvīpa would be obviously the group of three islands called Barawa by the Arabs and situated at a distance of 100 farsangs from Fansur or Baros

---

1. R.C.Majumdar, Suvarnadvīpa, I.52-53.
2. XIII.10.
3. LV.5.
4. p.36 ll.26-36.
5. Ferrand, Textes, p.523.
6. I.303.
7. Ferrand, Textes, pp.194, 346, 377, 381, 395.

on the coast of Sumatra.[1]

Tāmralipti in Bengal would appear to have been the chief port for sailing to Indonesia. It is not without significance that in most of the stories of the period the merchants sailing to Suvarṇadvīpa or Kaṭāha are said to start from Tāmralipti.[2] Merchants who are said to leave Pāṭaliputra[3] or Campā[4] for a voyage to Suvarṇadvīpa must have sailed from Tāmralipti. We have also references to Buddhist scholars like Dharmapāla (7th century) and Dīpaṅkara (11th century) proceeding from Bengal to Suvarṇadvīpa. From the late eighth century we find influences from northern India, especially from the Pāla dominions, becoming predominant in the culture of S.E.Asia. It is reflected not only in the use of the pre-Nāgarī script in a few Indonesian inscriptions[6] but also in the Indo-Javanese bronzes[7] and probably architecture as well.[8] The growth of the Cola power earlier towards the beginning of the eleventh century led to Southern India becoming the main Indian influence in Indonesian lands.[9]

---

1. Ibid., pp.583f.
2. Samarāiccakahā, p.327; Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha, XVIII.176ff; Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, II.183; K.S.S. (Tawney), III.175.
3. Bṛhatkathākośa, LIII.3ff.
4. Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha, XVIII.411.
5. I.H.Q., XIII.593, 596. See also ibid., p.597; R.C.Majumdar, Champa, p. xvii.
6. I.H.Q., XIII.590.
7. B.K.I., XC pp.73f.
8. R.C.Majumdar, Suvarṇadvīpa, II.351.
9. Ibid.

However, indications are not wanting to suggest that eastern India continued to maintain direct contacts with S.E.Asia.[1] The Samarāiccakahā mentions Vaijayantī as another port from which ships sailed for Indonesian lands.[2] The hoards from the islands of Ramree and Cheduba off the coast of Burma and Siam sometimes contain coins of king Śaktivarman Cālukyacandra of the E.Cālukya dynasty of Vengī (A.D. 1000-1011).[3] This points to the direct and intimate contact of the Cālukya dominions with these areas. We have several proofs for the long established and continuous intercourse between the Tamil country and S.E.Asia. By far the most significant of these is the inscription from Lobu Tuwa (A.D.1088) in Sumatra referring to the community of Tamil merchants called the Five Hundred of the Thousand Quarters.[4] Prapañca in his work Nāgarakĕrtāgama written in Java in 1365 speaks of people among others from Jambūdvīpa (India), Karṇāṭaka (in South India) and Goḍa (Gauḍa), coming unceasingly and in large numbers in ships accompanied by monks and brāhmaṇas.[5] This makes it clear that even up to that late date the trade between

---

1. I.H.Q., XIII.597.
2. Cf. Motichandra, Sārthavāha, p.199. This port cannot be identified.
3. G.Yazdani, Early History of the Deccan, p.804.
4. K.A.N.Sastri, A Tamil Merchant-Guild in Sumatra in Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde, 1932, p.314.
5. Java in the 14th century (The Nāgara-kĕrtāgama) by Rakawi Prapañca of Majapahit, Vol.III p.98 (Canto 83, stanza 4).

the two countries continued to flourish. The fact that besides Jambūdvīpa, Karṇāṭaka and Gauḍa have been mentioned separately would suggest that of all the coastal areas in India these two enjoyed the major share of the trade. But we cannot minimise the role of the Gujarati traders. Legends in Java preserve the memory of a late wave of emigration from Gujarat.[1] A traditional Gujarati verse which may look back to our period observes that he who goes to Java never returns; if by chance he returns, he brings back money enough to live on for two generations.[2] Some of the tomb-stones of the Sultāns of Samudra-Pase, probably imported from Gujarat[3], also suggest the trade relations between the two areas. Even as late as the time of Albuquerque we find the Portuguese sailors paying a high compliment to the Gujarati sailors who because of their great commerce with the eastern countries knew that route much better than all other nations.[4]

x x x x x x x x

In the sea-trade with the Muslim countries the areas on the western coast of India had a significant role but the eastern coast does not appear to have much to do with it. It would have found voyages to S.E.Asia more profitable than covering a long distance to reach the Muslim countries. It is for this reason

---

1. T.S.Raffles, The History of Java, II.87ff.
2. A.K.Forbes, Rās Mālā, p.418.
3. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.268.
4. J.A., 1918, p.165.

that the records of this area do not show any awareness of the maritime connections with the Muslim countries. The Chinese text Liang-shu states that central T'ien-chu had much sea-trade among others with Ta-ts'in and An-si (Parthia)[1]. But it is difficult to believe on the basis of the uncorroborated testimony of this text that eastern India had any considerable maritime trade with the Muslim countries.

Abū Zaid would suggest that Indian merchants used to visit Siraf in large numbers and that they had very friendly relations with the Muslim merchants of that place. He says that when one of the principal merchants of Siraf invited the Indian merchants of the places he would serve them food in separate plates. On such occasions there would be about hundred guests[2], most of whom obviously were Indians. The Jewish traveller Rabbi Benjamin writing about 1170 says that the island of Kish[3] was the point to which the Indian merchants bring their commodities[4]. In the time of Ibn Batūta Indian ships coming from Thana, Quilon, Calicut, Fandarina (Pantalayini Kollam), Shaliyat (Chaliam), Mangalore, Fakanor (Barkur), Hinawr (Honavar), and Sindabur (Sadashivagad) called at the port of Aden, where lived a colony

---

1. Chau Ju-kua, p.113 ll.41f.
2. Ferrand, Voyage du Marchand Arabe Sulayman, p.138.
3. The island of Kays is situated in the Persian Gulf at a distance of nine miles from the Persian Gulf.
4. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.134.

of Indian merchants.[1] From Marco Polo it would appear that the Indians were going up to the island of Socotra, mentioned by him as the centre to which Indian pirates brought their loot for disposal.[2] It would follow from the Jagaḍucarita that merchants like Jagaḍu had Indian agents at Hormus and maintained regular trade with Persia, transporting goods in their own ships.[3] In the Moharājaparājaya[4] we read of Kubera, the business magnate of Anahilvāḍa leaving the port of Bhṛgukaccha for a foreign land in the company of fifty-five merchants and with five hundred ships under him. The western terminus for the Indian ships would appear to have changed from time to time. Thus in the seventh century it was Basrah, from where it was transferred to Siraf and then successively to Kish and Hormuz.[5] The dominance of the Arabs would not have left much scope for Indian ships to proceed further to the west. Leaving aside the possibility of an occasional Indian ship to venture ahead in the Red Sea[6] it appears that trade with Mesopotamia, Egypt or the Eastern coasts of Africa was mostly in the hands of the Persians and the Arabs.[7]

---

1. See The Delhi Sultanate, p.648.
2. (Yule) II.389.
3. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.267.
4. Act III p.61.
5. Cathay and the Way Thither , I.84-5.
6. Cf. Hourani, Op. cit., p.82 f.n.79 for a 10th century reference to Indian ships at al-qulzum.
7. Cf. Hourani, Op. cit., pp.79f.

The Indian sailors and merchants, forced by the competition of the Arabs and the Chinese, would appear to have concentrated on coastal trade. Indian traderas visited the ports on the east and the west coast selling their local wares or those brought from foreign lands by foreigners. They generally ventured only up to Ceylon. In Indian stories of the period we often have references to Indian merchants visiting Ceylon.[1] An eighth century inscription from Ceylon indicates that Indian traders were trading in Ceylon.[2] The early Bengali merchants generally traded with Ceylon and Patan in Gujarat and visited Puri, Kaliṅga or Kaliṅgapaṭam, Cīkāculi (Chicacole), Bānpur , Setubandha Rāmeśvar and Nilacca (Laccadives).[3] In the Arab accounts also we find indications to suggest that sailors from one port of India used to visit other ports for trade. Thus Al-Idrīsī observes that Debal was inhabited only because it was a station for the vessels of Sind and other countries and refers to the vessels of India coming to it.[4] The same writer refers to vessels from India and Sind casting anchor at Fandarīna[5] (Pantalayini Kollam), and also to Barūh (Broach) being the port

---

1. K.S.S. (Tawney) VI.211.
2. J.A.S.B., 1935, p.12.
3. T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, p.30.
4. Elliot and Dowson, I.77.
5. Ibid., 90.

for the vessels of Sind.[1]

In sea-trade besides the merchants engaged in the actual shipping of merchandise there was a class of disbursing merchants who brought the goods from the foreign merchants and circulated them in the country. It appears that gradually the Indian merchants were leaving the major part of actual shipping to the foreigners and confining themselves to distribution. Thus for example Al-Idrīsī observes that at Debal trade was carried on in a great variety of articles and that the rich inhabitants of Debal brought in bulk wares brought in the vessels of other countries and stored themm until they became scarce.[2] Likewise Chau Ju-kua refersx to ships from differentpartsx of Sumatra coming to Nan-p'i (Malabar) and Ku-lin (Quilon) taking the products of the latter and bringing their own in exchange.[3] Marco Polo also in speaking of Cambay and Somnath refers to merchants from many lands bringing their merchandise to these places and taking away with them those of these kingdoms.[4] In the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[5] we read of a merchant who invests his capital in purchasing sacks of mañjiṣṭhā imported from abroad. It appears that the Indonesian merchants had dominance only up

---

1. Ibid., 87.
2. Ibid., 77. Cf. Ibn Haukal in Elliot and Dowson, I.37.
3. pp. 88-89.
4. (A.Ricci and D.Ross) pp. 334, 335.
5. p. 70 ll.2ff.

to Quilon[1] but the ports to its north were frequented by the Muslims. We have many references to the presence of Muslims on the western coast of India.[2] It appears that their wealth was bringing them importance in society and the state. A reference in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi indicates that an Arab trader Saida (Sayyad) had become so powerful as to venture to engage in a naval fight with Vastupāla, the minister of the Caulukya state.[3] Trading with the Arab merchants must have been a source of large gains to the local merchants and the state. The Arab writers praise the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings for their sympathetic and considerate regard for the Arabs.[4] This has been lauded by modern scholars as a noble example of religious toleration,[5] but no doubt economic factors were equally important. The Arab traders brought rich dividends to the state and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas by patronising them wanted to enjoy the monopoly of the wares brought by the Arab merchants. The force of the economic factor

---

1. Chau Ju-kua, pp.88-89.
2. E.I., XXXII p.66 ll.6-13; XXXIII.236f (the editor does not notice that the merchant is Muslim); V.V.Mirashi's article on Chinchini plates in the J.N.Banerjea Volume, pp.96-109; Ibn Haukal in Elliot and Dowson, I.34, 36; Al-Idrīsī in ibid., pp. 88, 89; P.I.H.C., 1939, p.647; Indian Archaeology, 1959-60, p.62.
3. p.102 ll.10ff.
4. See Sulaimān, Al-Mas'ūdī, Al-Iṣṭakhrī and Ibn Haukal, and Al-Idrīsī-Elliot and Dowson, I.4, 24, 34, 88.
5. E.g., A.S.Altekar in The Age of Imperial Kanauj, p.17; A.K. Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.267.

becomes clear in the story from the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[1] which states that when there was a quarrel between the minister Vastupāla and the Arab merchant Saida (Sayyad) at the port of Stambha (Cambay) the latter requisitioned to his help Mahāsādhanika Saṅkha from the port of Bhṛgukaccha (Broach). Harihara has composed a historical play Śaṅkhaparābhava Vyāyoga to commemorate the ultimate victory of Vastupāla, the governor of Stambhatīrtha, when the port was attacked by Śaṅkha, the son of Sindhurāja, the ruler of Lāṭa.[2] Harihara was associated with Vastupāla and so his comtemporary testimony should be accepted for the historicity of the event. It would appear from this that the coastal powers were trying earnestly to attract the Arab merchants to their ports[3], and this gives the clue for the religious toleration on the part of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. The powers on the western coast, especially the Caulukyas and the Yādavas, were often clashing for controlling the province of Lāṭa with its ports of Cambay and Broach. The prosperity of the Caulukyas would seem to have been due to their possessing the three ports of Cambay, Broach and Somanātha. The Paramāras being denied any share of sea-trade were comparatively less prosperous. It was with a desire to participate in this lucrative sea- trade

---

1. p. 102 ll.10ff.
2. J.O.I., VII.272.
3. See Prabandhacintāmani, p.103 for the policy of Vastupāla.

that the Paramāras tried and succeeded, though only temporarily, in controlling Broech.[1]

It is clear that the states on the western coast tried to regulate the sea-trade so as to get the best out of it. We have a significant indication of this in the accounts of the Jewish traveller Benjamin who records the facilities provided to foreign merchants by the king of Chulam (Quilon). He says : "This nation is very trustworthy in matters of trade, and whenever foreign merchants enter their port, three secretaries of the king immediately repair on board their vessels, write down their names and report them to him. The king thereupon grants them security for their property, which they may even leave in the open fields without guard. One of the king's officers sits in the market, and receives goods that may have been found anywhere, and which he returns to those applicants who can minutely describe them. This custom is observed in the whole empire of the king"[2]. In the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[3] also we read of the concern of king Yogarāja that ships coming to the port of Someśvara should not be molested. The Mānasollāsa[4] recommends a king to provide protection to shippings and lays

---

1. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.265.
2. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.134.
3. p.14 ll.3ff.
4. I p.62 vv.374-76.

down regular license fees for ships calling at the ports. In his inscription from Motupalli[1] the Kākatiya king Ganapatideva guarantees security to the ships visiting his port and mentions the details of the dues to be paid by them. We find the Śilāhāra king Raṭṭarāja also fixing the duty to be paid by the ships.[2]

x x x x x x x x

Our sources speak of a number of ports on the east and west coasts of India. In Bengal Tāmralipti enjoyed the position of one of India's major ports, especially for voyages to S.E.Asia. But the silting up of the mouth of the Sarasvatī and the shifting of its course decreased the utility of Tāmralipti and we find Saptagrāma gradually emerging as the major port of Bengal.[3] Other ports on the eastern coast of India mentioned in the early Bengali literature are Puri, Kaliṅga or Kaliṅgapaṭam, Cikāculi (Chicacole), Bāmpur and Rāmeśvara.[4] Ma'bar or the Coromandel coast appears to have grown into a virtual clearing-house for the ships coming alike from the East and the West. Wassaf refers to the products of China, India and Sind laden on huge ships constantly coming to Ma'bar and observes significantly that the wealth of the isles of the Persian Gulf and the beauty

---

1. E.I., XII p.195.
2. E.I., III p. 301.
3. History of Bengal, p.4.
4. T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali society, p.30.

and adornment of other countries from Irāq and Khurāsān as far as Rum and Europe are derived from Ma'bar which is so situated as to be the key of Hind.[1] Rashiheddin[2] also says the same. Marco Polo[3] speaks of ships from the Persian Gulf and the Arabian coast with goods laden for sale visiting Cail (Kayal). The Arab writers refer to many ports in this area Qayrah (Kāveri-paṭṭanam), Manifattan or Malifattanm (Nāgapaṭṭanam), Abāṭū (Adirāmpaṭṭaṇam), Taṇḍā (Toṇḍi), Daqtan (Devipaṭṭanam) and Fāṭnī (Kilakarai).[4] A recently discovered inscription suggests that of these Nāgapaṭṭinam was the most important.[5] Of the ports on the Malabar coast Quilon had become important. From the Arab writers it becomes clear that ships coming from the west called at the port of Quilon for taking in fresh water before sailing for Kalah-bar (Kedah).[6] The Chinese sources likewise state that the Chinese traders going to the country of the Arabs had to tranship at Ku-lin (Quilon) to smaller boats.[7] Abu Dulaf also mentions Kawlam (Quilon) as the port of embarkation for Oman in Arabia.[8] The Ling-wai-ta refers to the people of Sumatra and

---

1. Elliot and Dowson, III.32.
2. Ibid., I.69.
3. II.370.
4. Nainar, Arab Geographers, s.v.
5. J.N.S.I., XX.13.
6. Nainar, Op. cit., pp.44-45.
7. Chau Ju-kua, pp.24, 91 (n.17).
8. Nainar, Op. cit., pp.46f.

Arabia bringing their wares to trade in the country of Ku-lin (Quilon)[1]. The prosperity of Quilon seems to have continued up to the time of Marco Polo, who refers to merchants from South China and Arabia making profitable voyages to Malabar, in particular the port of Quilon. The Arab writers mention other ports on the western coast which were obviously not so much in use : Kūdāfarīd (Aḷimukam) , Sinjilī (Kodungallur), Tandiyūr (Kadalundi), Shāliyāt (Chaliam), Fandarīna (Pantalāyini Kollam), Dafhfattān (Dharmadam), Buddfattān (Baliapatam), Jurbatan (Srikandapuram), Fūfal (Bekal), Harqilya (Kasargod), Khurnal (Kumbla), Manjarūr (Mangalore), Fākanūr (Bārkūr), Bāsrūr (Basrur), Saymūr (Shirur), Barqalī (Bhatkal), Hannūr (Hanovar), Habār (Kārwār), Sindābūr (Sadashivagad), Sandān (Sindhudurg), Tāna (Thana) and Sūbāra (Sopara)[3]. The ports on the Gujarat coast also played an important part in the international sea-trade. It is from the port of Bhṛgukaccha that Kubera, the merchant chief of Anahilvāḍa, is said to have set sail for trading with a foreign country[4]. Al-Idrīsī[5] mentions Barūh (Broach) as a port

---

1. Chau Ju-kua, p.91 (n.16). From Chau Ju-kua we learn that the ships from Sumatra were calling at the port of Quilon (p.89) and that the products of Nan-p'i (Malabar) were being carried to the different parts of Sumatra (p.88).
2. II.390, 376.
3. Nainar, Arab Geographers', Index, s.v.
4. Moharājaparājaya, III p.61.
5. Elliot and Dowson, I.87.

of call for ships coming from China and Sind. From Marco Polo[1] we learn of the regular export of the products of Gujarat to Arabia and other lands. He refers to the port of Cambay as being visited by merchants with many ships and cargoes.[2] It has been suggested that the Gurjara- Pratihāras developed Cambay or Stambhatīrtha as a rival port to Broach, which was under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.[3] Somanatha, the famous religious centre, was a third important port in the area. Al-Bīrūnī speaks of its fame as a station for those who went to and fro between Sufala in the country of Zanj (Zanzibar) and China.[4] Debal near the mouth of the Indus was a large mart and the port meeting the needs of an extensive area.[5] Al-Idrīsī observes that ships laden with the products of Oman and the vessels of China and India used to come to this port.[6] He gives a graphic account of the advantages which this naval station possessed : "Merchandise from every country is found here, and is sent on from hence to other countries. It is placed at the extremity of a bay, where vessels can enter and cast anchor. It is well-supplied with water and there is a fine fortress erected by the government of

---

1. II.393.
2. II.398.
3. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.265,
4. II.104.
5. Elliot and Dowson, I.37.
6. Ibid., 77.

India to prevent the inroads of the inhabitants of the island of Kish.[1]

x x x x x x x

The Arabs received from India much valuable merchandise which they required for their own consumption and which brought them rich profits when exported to the east or the west. The Khalifa Umar was told by a trader that in India the rivers are pearls, the mountains gems and the trees scented water.[2] The Arab traders therefore preferred to sail to India than go towards the west.[3] It would appear that articles exported from India continued to remain the main attraction of the sea-trade of the period. The Ḥudūd al 'Ālam gives a list of Indian exports which included perfumes like musk, aloes, amber and camphor, pearls of various varieties and sizes, diamonds, corals, and innumerable kinds of medicinal herb.[4] Ibn Khordadbah[5] mentions diverse species of aloe-wood, sandalwood, camphor and camphor-water, nutmeg, clovepink, cubeb, cocoanut, vegetable stuffs,[6] textiles of velvety cotton and ~~elephants~~ ivory as articles exported by India.

---

1. Elliot and Dowson, I.84. Elliot has misread Kanbāya for Daybul-Nainar, Op. cit., p.52 f.n.87-88.
2. See S.S.Nadavī, Araba aura Bhārata ke Sambandha, p.54.
3. Abū Zaid in Ancient Accounts of India and China, pp.40ff.
4. p. 86.
5. Ferrand, Textes, p.31.
6. Ferrand translates it as "des étoffes végétales". But S.S. Nadavī, loc. cit., p.55 takes it to mean textiles of hemp.

Benjamin, the Jewish traveller, would suggest that spices were the chief merchandise of India. Speaking of the island of Kish he says that Indian merchants brought there great quantities of spices.[1] According to Marco Polo[2] Indian merchants visiting Hormuz brought with them spices, precious stones, pearls, clothes of silk and gold, elephants' tusks and so forth.

The foreign accounts help us to determine the exports of the ports in different parts of India. Thus we can say on the testimony of Ibn Khordadbah[3] that Sind exported costus, canes and bamboos. According to Chau Ju-kua[4] Gujarat exported to Arabia great quantities of indigo, red kino, myrobalans and foreign cotton stuffs of all colours.[5] Marco Polo[6] mentions pepper, ginger and indigo as the products of Gujarat and very often refers to the delicate and beautiful buckrams and to the export of good buckram and cotton from the province of Gujarat.[7] Ibn Rosteh mentions teak as an export from the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom.

---

1. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.134.
2. I.107.
3. Elliot and Dowson, I.15.
4. p. 92.
5. Locally manufactured cloth of no great worth was referred to simply as foreign cloth (fan pu)-J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXII, Pt 2 (1959), p.61.
6. II.383.
7. II.379, 385, 388.
8. Ferrand, Textes, p.74.

Chau Ju-kua mentions fine swords, tóu-lo cotton stuffs and common cotton cloth[1] as the products of P'öng-k'ie-lo (kingdom of Balharas)[2] and best quality of putchuck[3] and fine white flowered and dotted cotton stuffs as those of Nan-ni-hua-lo (Anhilvada)[4]. Obviously these must have been sent abroad from the ports on the Gujarat coast. We have already shown that there was a regular export of slaves to Persia from the Gujarat coast, so much so that Tejapāla, the minister of Vīradhavala, was seriously concerned to stop it.[5]

In some of the Chinese accounts we get lists of the exports of Tién-chu[6], but the names of the commodities do not seem to

---

1. The text uses ases tou-lo-mien which is a composite coinage from Sanskrit tūla=cotton and Chinese mien=dowry. As contrasted with this other cotton piece-goods are referred to simply as mien pu or pu-P.Wheatley, Geographical Notes on some commodities involved in Sung Maritime Trade in J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXII, Pt 2 (1959), p.59.
2. p. 97. P.Wheatley, loc. cit., p.52 restores P'öng-k'ie-lo as Bangalore and its capital Ch'a-na-chi as Kannada (Karnāṭa).
3. Mu-hsiang or putchuck is one of the most difficult of Chau Ju-kua's aromatics to identify. True putchuck is an Himalayan herb, Saussurea lappa, whose bitter root, smelling like a mixture of musk and orris, was used from ancient times as a universal panacea. See P.Wheatley, loc. cit., p.62.
4. p. 98.
5. See supra p.127.
6. pp. 111, 113 (n.3 - for Hóu Han-shu and Liang-shu).

have been from eastern India alone. Thus we have references to rhinoceros (horns), elephants and ivory, leopards (skin), lions, sables, camels, marmot[1] (? skins), tortoise-shell, gold, silver, copper, iron, lead and tin, sugarcane, sugar, pepper, ginger, sandalwood and other aromatic woods, black salt, all kinds of fruit, gold embroidered (skin) rugs, fine hemps, po-tié[2] (white muslin), fine fur garments, handsome rugs called t'a-töng, a stone like talc (called huo-ts'i) and diamond. The Arab accounts mention aloe-wood and a variety of fine cotton fabrics as the products of Rahma or Ruhmi[3] which is generally identified with the Pāla kingdom.[4] They also mention the horns of rhinoceros as an important export from the kingdom of Rahma to China.[5] It also seems that Rahma was known for its fly-whisks made of samara (yak-tail)[6] hair.[7] Sulaimān and Al-Mas'ūdī definitely mention gold and silver as being found in the kingdom of Rahma.[8] We know that these metals are found not in Bengal but in Lower Burma.[9]

---

1. The marmot is an animal living in sub-Arctic conditions and hence the present reference is perhaps a mistake.
2. J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXII, Pt 2 (1959), p.59.
3. Elliot and Dowson, I.14, 5.
4. I.H.Q., XVI pp.232ff; History of Bengal I p.122.
5. Ferrand, Textes, pp.44, 105.
6. Probably referring to Sanskrit cāmara.
7. Ferrand, loc. cit.
8. Ibid.
9. Çoedès, Histoire Ancienne des Etats Hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient, p.135.

It would appear that the Arab narratives included both Lower Burma and Bengal in the kingdom of Rahma.

We have now to see what India received for the things she exported. The Vaijayantī employs the term turuṣka for incense,[1] suggesting that incense was imported from the Middle East, probably from the coast of Hadharamaut in South Arabia.[2] Likewise the use of the terms mleccha for copper[3] and yavaneṣṭa for lead[4] would imply that these metals were also in the list of India's imports from the west. We must also note that in this dictionary yavana is the word for salt from saline soil[5] and yavaneṣṭa for a kind of onion.[6] Ibn Said refers to the import of dates from Basra into Debal in Sind.[7] Al-Mas'ūdī states that ivory was brought from Zanj (Zanzibar) to Oman and from there was shipped to India and China.[8] The dye called kṛmirāga (kiramdana) was imported from Persia. The Jain texts contain absurd stories about the preparation of this dye,[9] which were probably

---

1. p.132 l.221.
2. The Struggle for Empires, p.522.
3. p.43 l.49.
4. p.43 l.59.
5. p.133 l.245.
6. p.62 l.414.
7. Ferrand, Textes, p.48 f.n.
8. Prairies d'or, III.7-8 sq. in Chau Ju-kua, p.127 n.4.
9. A.N.Upadhye, Bṛhatkathākośa, Introduction, p.88.

told by the Persian traders to keep the secret of its manufacture and also to emphasise its rarity and high cost. V.S.Agrawala[1] traces a reference to petroleum[2] from the oil fields of Persia in the expression Pārasīkataila used in the Vikramāṅkadevacarita.[3]

It would appear from Abū Zaid that formerly India used to get the dīnārs called Sindiat,[4] emeralds from Egypt, coral and the stone dahnaj (a stone resembling emerald). But the cessation of the trade in these things[5] probably indicates that the west no longer gave so much of gold but had found a profitable item of export to India. It is clear from many references that India spent huge sums on importing horses from the West. With the increasing use of horses in war accompanied by the increase in the number of feudal lords and chiefs there was a growing demand for horses. It becomes clear from a study of Indian texts that foreign breeds of western areas in general and of Vanāyu or Arabia in particular were much valued in India.[6] Indians needed a continuous import of horses because the imported ones

---

1. I.H.Q., XIII.226.
2. Petroleum only applies to the very highly refined spirit used in cars etc. It is hardly likely that this was manufactured. Probably the reference is to a heavy thick oil, more like modern lubricating oil.
3. IX.20.
4. Most likely because they were minted in Sind.
5. Elliot and Dowson, I.11.
6. Abhidhānaratnamālā, v.439; Vaijayantī, p.111 l.189.

could not ~~ignore~~ remain useful for long owing to the ignorance of the Indians of their proper management, training and feeding. These horses could not be bred in India. The Indians had no farriers and the foreign merchants, with a view to preserving the monopoly of their trade, prevented any farrier from coming to India. In the Chinese text Ling-wai-ta also we have a reference to the Arabs importing horses to Quilon.[2] In the Prabandha-cintāmani the cargo of a ship coming ϕto the port of Stambha is said to have included ten thousand horses.[3] But in order to have an idea of the drain which this import meant to India we must study western sources. It would appear that by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries this trade had reached astounding heights. According to Wassaf[4] an Arab merchant had made an agreement with a Pāṇḍya king to bring to Ma'bar as many horses as he could procure from the islands of the Persian Gulf. Each horse cost 220 dīnārs of 'red gold' (=550 saggi of Marco Polo[5]=550/6 oz.) and the total number of horses which Ma'bar, Kambayat and other ports received from the ports on the Arabian Sea and Persian Gulf was 14,000 costing 2,2000,000 dīnārs. Marco Polo[6] notes that each of the Pāṇḍya kings every year purchased 2000 horses at the rate

---

1. Wassaf in Elliot and Dowson, III.33-34; Marco Polo II.340, 345, 450.
2. Chau Ju-kua, p.91 n.16.
3. p.14 ll.13-19.
4. Elliot and Dowson, III.33-34.
5. Yule, Marco Polo II.349 f.n.
6. II.340.

of 500 saggi (=$\frac{500}{6}$ oz.) of gold per horse. Elsewhere Marco Polo[1] observes that each horse imported from the Persian Gulf was sold at 200 livres of Persian money (=£193 according to Yule).

In the list of exports from China to India Chinese silk naturally occupies an important place. Rashiheddin speaks of Chinese junks bringing to Ma'bar clothes from Chin and Māchin.[2] It would appear from Marco Polo that India received clothes of silk and gold as well as 'sandals' (a silk textile) from China.[3] In Indian literary texts we often have references to the use of Chinese silk (cīnāṁśuka).[4] From these it would follow that the quantity of Chinese fabrics imported to India was quite significant. In the mathematical text Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha[5] two problems are set referring to numerous large pieces of Chinese silk. In the Vaijayantī the use of the terms cīnapaṭṭa[6] for tin and cīna[7] for iron would suggest that India imported some amount of these metals from China. India would appear also to have

---

1. I.83.
2. Elliot and Dowson, I.69.
3. II.390. See also ibid., II.24, 132, 152, 157, 176, 181.
4. Kuttanīmata, vv.66, 344; Naiṣadhīyacarita, XXI.2.
5. IV.19-20. 300 pieces of 6 hastas x 6 hastas, 720 pieces of 5 hastas x 3 hastas, 70 pieces of 5 hastas x 9 hastas and 525 pieces of 2 hastas x 3 hastas.
6. p.43 l.60. China is situated at the northern extremity of the world's most extensive and richest metallogenetic tin province-J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXII, Pt 2 (1959), p.115.
7. p.43 l.65. See J.M.B.R.A.S., XXXII, Pt 2 (1959), p.117 - iron and irommongery were amongst the commonest commodities shipped from China to the South Seas.

received gold and silver from China. In 1296 the Chinese government had to prohibit the export of gold and silver and to limit the value of the trade with Ma'bar, Kulam and Pandaraina.[1] The Chinese accounts significantly remark that in return for the native produce which the Cola embassy of 1077 offered, the Chinese emperor gave strings of cash and taels of silver.[2] A Tamil inscription of the early years of the eleventh century indicates that south India was receiving Chinese gold, probably through Indonesia.[3]

Chau Ju-kua gives list of articles which Nan-p'i (Malabar) received in exchange of its merchandise from Kio-lo Ta-nung (Twala Terang on Perak coast) and San-fo-ts'i (Palembang). These are ho-ch'ï silks, porcelain-ware, camphor (chang-nau), rhubarb, bees wax (huang-lién), cloves, lump-camphor (nau-tzï), sandal-wood, cardamoms and gharu-wood.[4] It was the spices of S.E.Asia which formed the chief article of the ancient trade, and the cloves, spikenard and other fine species which Malabar is said to have received from the East[5] were evidently brought from Java and Sumatra.[6] Al-Kazwīnī[7] also speaks of aloe-wood being brought

---

1. T'oung Pao, XV.425-26.
2. Chau Ju-kua, p.101 n.12.
3. J.N.S.I., XX.13. But there are no Indonesian reference to this trade.
4. pp. 88f.
5. Marco Polo II.390.
6. Ibid., 272, 284.
7. Elliot and Dowson, I.96.

to Quilon from the islands beyond the equator. In the Indian texts of the period we find elaborate lists of the agricultural products of the region. Thus we have references to camphor, areca-nuts, betel plants, sandal trees, lavaṅga, lavalī, cocoa-nut plantain, panasa and piṇḍakharjūra besides rājatalī, tamāla and mandāra.[1] In the Vaijayantī takkola is the word for the fruit of Calyptranthes Jambalana.[2] After spices the next important item on the list of imports to India from the south-east Asian islands was that of metals. According to Marco Polo the foreign merchants coming to Cambay brought with them above all gold, silver, copper and blue vitriol.[3] It would appear that the merchants referred to here were those from S.E.Asia as Marco Polo himself observes in another context that ships coming to Malabar from the east brought copper in ballast as well as gold and silver.[4] It was the lure of gold which had attracted Indians to these islands. The epithet "the product of Suvarṇadvīpa" applied to gold in the Vaijayantī[5] would imply the export of gold from Suvarṇadvīpa to India. A story in the Samarāiccakahā[6] would indicate that Indian merchants returning from Suvarṇadvīpa

---

1. Samarāiccakahā, VI p.41; Tilakamañjarīt, pp.133, 135, 137, 140
2. p.131 l.210.
3. II.395, 398.
4. II.390.
5. p.42 l.21.
6. VI pp.38-39.

brought with them blocks of gold marked with their names. We read in the Tilakamañjarī[1] that one could see in the islands here and there many mines of gems, gold and silver and also an abundance of pearls in the heaps of oysters piled in enormous quantity. Indulging in rhetoric the text adds that even in the houses of the poor could be found innumerable gems fit for kings and that fine gold and silver were neglected as if equal to dust. This seems to be an exaggerated and idealised account of the wealth for which south-east Asian countries were famous. In the stories of the period we often read of merchants going to these islands and obtaining jewels.[2] These islands would appear to have exported fine textiles such as silk to India. The Mānasollāsa[3] would seem to imply this when it refers to fabrics of many islands to be used by a king but mentions distinctly those from China and Ceylon. Surprisingly the Chinese text Ling-wai-ta mentions the merchants of Kién-pi (Kampar, Eastern coast of Sumatra) as bringing every year elephants and cattle to trade in the country of Ku-lin[4] (Quilon).

As regards articles coming from Ceylon probably the most important were pearls.[5] The synonyms for dry ginger[6] and tin[7] in

---

1. p. 133.
2. Upamiti, pp.996-8; Samarāiccakahā, II pp.96f; VI p.42.
3. II p.90 v.1040. Also vv.1018-9. Most silk seems, however, to have been imported from China.
4. Chau Ju-kua, p.91.n.16.
5. Cf. Karpūramañjarī, II.
6. p.129 l.150.
7. p.43 l.62.

the Vaijayantī would suggest that India was receiving these articles from Ceylon. The Mānasollāsa[1] refers to the fine fabrics from Ceylon as stuffs fit for a king.

In order to get an idea of the volume and balance of trade we have to emphasise certain limitations of this trade. As compared with modern trade the trade of our period was extremely slow, limited alike in its volumes and variety. No doubt there were some changes in the articles of trade as compared with earlier times. In the lists of imports and exports to different countries we do find increasing importance being attached to certain essentials of daily life like drugs and spices. But the trade was still essentially in luxuries. It has to be realised that in spite of all the progress made in the art of ship-building and navigation the sailors and the merchants were at the mercy of the roaring waves of the unfathomable seas and the unpredictable and unmanagable winds and storms. The fear from the pirates also added to the perils of the sea. In this way the merchant could only concentrate on precious articles of luxury which have comparatively smaller volume and weight. The population of the countries engaged in this trade was still mostly agricultural, and, concentrated in economically self-sufficient villages, had practically no desire for foreign wares or ability to pay for them. The demand for the foreign

---

1. II p.90 v.1040.

merchandise came from the class of rulers and chiefs.

For want of relevant data it is now practically impossible to determine the volume of India's imports and exports, but we can gather some idea of it from stray references. In the Chinese sources we do have some indications but they are marred by our ignorance of the unit of count referred to and of the precise share of the different countries in the trade. However, it has to be noted that from 1049 to 1053 the annual importation of elephants' tusks, rhinoceros horns, strings of pearls, aromatics, incense etc. was over 53,000 units of count which increased in 1175 to over 500,000 units.[1] The accounts of the Cola embassy of 1015, though handed down in an exaggerated form, may be utilised to give an idea of the amount of export. Thus the Cola king is said tom have sent among other presents, 21,000 ounces of pearls, 60 elephants' tusks, and 60 catties of frankincense; but the gifts actually handed by the envoy are said to have included 6,600 ounces of perls and 3,300 catties of perfumes.[2] We learn from the same Chinese source that in return for the Indian produce brought by the Cola embassy in 1077 the Chinese emperor gave 81,800 strings of cash and 52,000 taels of silver.[3]

---

1. Chau Ju-kua, p.19 n.4.
2. Ibid., p.101 n.12.
3. Ibid.

It has been sometimes suggested[1] that India had an unfavourable balance of trade in this period. We fear we have not enough relevant references to speak in terms of exact figures. No doubt, the balance of India's profits had decreased considerably when compared with earlier times, but this did not amount to an unfavourable balance of trade. A major share of this profit was apparently enjoyed by the ports of southern India, especially those on the Coromandel coast and the Malabar coast. The ports in the Gujarat and Cambay area also enjoyed a significant share. In the second rank we may place the ports on the Konkana coast and those of Bengal. Bengal did have maritime connections with south-east Asia but it would appear that, being rather out of way for the direct route which monopolised the lucrative trade between the east and the west, its share was not enviable.

The rate of profit in this trade must have been considerable. The very fact that merchants were willing to face the perils of the journey, the danger of loss sustained in it, the dues paid at different ports, and the whims and exactions of the chiefs would suggest that the margin of profit must have been high indeed. This is reflected in a traditional Gujarati verse saying that he who goes to Java never returns and that if

---

1. N.R.Ray, Bāṅgālir Itihās q. by A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.270.

by chance he returns he brings back money enough to live on for two generations.[1] Stray references indicate the high profits. Thus the Arab accounts speak of horns of rhinoceros exported from Rahma to China to be made into fashionable and costly girdles which sometimes fetched 2,000 or even 4,000 dīnārs each.[2] Even though literary accounts have a general air of rhetorical exaggeration it must be observed that in the realistic details of the voyage of a business magnate of Anhilvāḍa given in the Moharājaparājaya it is said that he returned from the foreign land when his takings had swollen to a sum of four crore gold pieces.[3]

As regards the reasons for the decrease in the total profits of India we have already discussed the growing competition of the Arabs, the Indonesians and the Chinese and have referred to Indian traders being generally content to distribute the wares within their country leaving other associated works to foreigners. Another reason seems to be that, as compared to earlier times, India had now a greater demand for imports. It is not unlikely that, with the increasing numbers of feudal lords and chiefs and the emphasis on show and grandeur, the demand for foreign

---

1. A.K.Forbes, Rās Mālā, p.418.
2. Ferrand, Textes, pp.44, 105.
3. Act III p.61.

wares also grew. It would appear that the patronage of merchants and the consumption of the merchandise brought by them was viewed as an issue of prestige by the ruling chiefs. Thus a story in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[1] speaks of a merchant, unable to sell his wares in the kingdom of King Vikramāditya of legendary fame, approaching the latter, who purchased the wares in order to remove the bad name which the non-sale of the article would have meant. The Mānasollāsa[2] also advises the king to decorate himself with fabrics of many islands. We can easily imagine the increase in the import of luxury articles resulting from this tendency. We have already referred to the drain caused by the import of a large number of horses. Thus it would appear that India did not earn much bullion in this period. It is significant that in some of the stories of the period we read that Indian merchants on reaching foreign markets sold their merchandise and took in foreign wares in exchange.[3] The statement of Abū Zaid that during his time, unlike earlier times, India was not receiving many dīnārs has already been referred to.[4] Chau Ju-kua[5] also speaks of the products of Nan-p'i (Malabar) being exchanged with the goods of Sumatra. In the early Bengali

---

1. p.5.
2. II p.90 v.1040.
3. Cf. Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā, pp.870-72 - gṛhītam pratibhāndam.
4. Elliot and Dowson, I.11.
5. pp.88f.

literature also we find lists of foreign articles which the Bengali merchants are said to have received in exchange for their own.[1] No doubt we have some references to Chinese gold coin coming to India[2], but it is significant that so far not a single gold coin of early medieval China has been recovered in India.

---

1. T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, pp.27-29.
2. See J.N.S.I., XX.13.

CHAPTER IX - CREDIT AND BANKING

The anarchy of the period resulting from local wars among the feudal lords, the insecurity on the roads and the menace of the Muslim invasion must have made capital shy. It was, therefore, necessary that the money-lenders should feel secure about the repayment of their money or else have possibilities of higher profits otherwise they would not invest their capital. The Mitākṣarā seems to be recognising this fact when it justifies higher rates of interest in case of traders traversing dense forests and sea-faring merchants on the ground of the great danger of the loss of even the principal as the debtors may perish by ship-wreck or from the attacks of robbers and wild beasts.

The commentaries and digests of the period cannot be credited with any newness of approach. They were expected only to harmonize and reconcile the existing authorities.[2] It is, therefore, not strange that Medhātithi upholds the older law relating to usury.[3] But even within this limitation we find a definite tendency towards giving the money-lender greater facilities,

---

1. On Yāj., II.38.
2. Medhātithi on Manu XI.216; Mitākṣarā on Yāj., I.4-5. Cf. Jaimini, II.1.46.
3. U.N.Ghoshal in the Age of Imperial Kanauj, p. 406.

especially about the safe recovery of his money.

Al-Bīrūnī was informed that the heir had to pay the debts of the deceased, either out of his share of of the stock of his own property even if the deceased had not left any property.[1] No doubt the rules aimed that the interests of the money-lender should not be jeopardised by the death of the debtor, but the laws were not as simple as Al-Bīrūnī would have them. The first three descendants, son, grandson and great-grandson, had to pay the debt if they inherited the ancestral property.[2] The Vīramitrodaya, analysing the law on the point, says that even when no ancestral property was received a son was liable to pay the debt with interest, a grandson was liable for thes debt without interest, and an unwilling great-grandson was not liable even for the principal.[3] The Vyavahāranirṇaya[4] observes that during the life-time of the debtor the sons and not the grandsons are liable, but in case no sons are alive the grandsons become liable. The commentary Vaijayantī[5] fixes the graded responsibilities of sons according to their liabilities. The Vivādaratnākara[6] modifies the existing law and says that the son

---

1. II.164.
2. Mitākṣarā on Yāj., II.51; Smṛticandrikā, II p. 171.
3. Vyavahāraprakāśa, p. 264.
4. p. 256.
5. On Viṣṇu Dh.S., IV.30.
6. p. 50.

was bound to pay at once and not entitled to wait for twenty years if the disease of his father was incurable or if it was certain that he would not return from his journey. Likewise, we find the Mitākṣarā[1] supporting the rule making the second husband of a widow liable for the debts incurred by the first husband.

Al-Idrīsī has a very interesting reference to the method of the realisation of debt in this period. He says that when a man has a right to demand anything of another, and he happens to meet him, he has only to draw a circular line upon the ground and to make his debtor enter it, which the latter never fails to do, and the debtor cannot leave this circle without satisfying his creditor, or obtaining the remission of the debt.[2] Apparently Al-Idrīsī was either idealising or had misinterpreted the custom. From Abhayatilaka Gaṇi and Hemacandra[3] it would appear that the treatment meted out to a debtor was not so humane. According to Abhayatilaka Gaṇi a creditor unable to obtain payment would take his debtor to a river bank where he would securely tie him with a chain and leave him exposed to the scorching sun. Temporarily deprived of the use of his limbs, the debtor could not like a tortoise and other animals enter the water to quench

---

1. On Yāj., II.51.
2. Elliot and Dowson, I.88.
3. Dvyāśrayakāvya, III.40.

his thirst. The creditor could press the debtor for the payment of his money. Even as early as the time of Kātyāyana[1] we have a reference to the custom in some countries of the creditor holding the debtor in restraint openly before an assembly of people until he pays what is due. The Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra[2] speaks of the creditor who sits at the door of his debtor to recover his debts (pratyupaviṣṭa). In the period of our study there are many references to creditors employing physical pressure to get their money back. As there is no suggestion of any interference by the state it would appear that the creditor was regarded as well within his rights in using such measures. Dāmodara[3], who was associated with the Gāhaḍavāla court, implies that it was quite unusual and normal for a money-lender to imprison a debtor for a very long period and to free him only on recovering full payment. The Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[4] also speaks of hard-hearted money-lenders who always confine their debtors in painful imprisonment from which it is difficult to be released.

It is laid down in one of the documents in the Lekhapaddhati[5] that if ever a mortgagee needed to get his money back before the due date of payment, in the company of the bhaṭṭa-

---

1. 580-584.
2. I.6.19.1.
3. Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa, p. 23 ll. 16-18.
4. pp. 1019-20.
5. pp. 19-21.

putras he could approach the mortgagor and the sureties and realise the principal and the interest. It is significantly added that all the expenses on account of the bhaṭṭaputras were to be paid by the mortgagor or his sureties. Apparently the bhaṭṭaputras were judicial officers like the dharmasthas mentioned in the Arthaśāstra.[1] According to Kauṭilya if the mortgagee apprehends any damage (or depreciation in value) of the mortgaged property he can with the permission of the dharmasthas sell it in the presence of the mortgagor.

From the same source it appears that the practice of requiring sureties for loans had become general. In one case even where a son borrows money out of his share of ancestral property we find a surety besides the witnesses.[2] In the case of mortgages we read of sureties who guaranteed the money on behalf of the debtor. Many documents in the Lekhapaddhati emphasise the responsibilities of a surety and specify his liabilities in detail. The responsibility of the sureties for the payment of the money was equal to that of the debtor himself, The sureties were collectively and severally responsible for the money and it was open to the creditor to realise his money from any of the sureties or from both the sureties and the debtor. It is

---

1. III.12.
2. p. 56.

specifically stated in the documents that the sureties were to regard themselves as debtors. If one of them was approached all were supposed to be approached, and when all were approached collectively each was supposed to be approached personally. It is further ~~st~~ laid down that if any of the sureties was approached for the payment, he was not to point to other sureties. If the mortgagee sold the property mortgaged to recover his dues and the proceeds of the sale were not sufficient the sureties had to meet the balance even by selling their own property or by borrowing from others. If the mortgaged property was damaged or destroyed by any natural calamity the sureties were still liable for all the payments and had no right to grumble on this ground.[1]

---

1. It has been suggested by A.K.Majumdar (Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp.280f) that the ādhipālas referred to in the Lekhapaddhati were villagers who acted as arbitrators in case the mortgagee wanted to foreclose before maturity on grounds of suspected depreciation in the mortgaged article (It is not correct to say that the functions of ādhipālas have been mentioned in only one document-LP, pp.19-20. They appear in others also-LP, pp.41f, 37f.). But a study of the documents clearly indicates that the reference is to sureties guaranteeing a mortgage. In the document referred to by Majumdar the expression occurs in connection with the liabilities of the sureities and it is distinctly stated that the surety guaranteeing a mortgage (ādhipālaka-pratibhūmiḥ) should pay to the mortgagee the stipulated amount together with interest and other expenses. In another document the reference is more clear (LP, pp.41f). It says that in case the sale proceeds of the mortgaged chattel are not sufficient and the mortgagor and the surety guaranteeing the mortgaged property (ādhipālakena pratibhuvā) should pay the remaining amount together with interest and other expenses out of their own property. Moreover, whereas one document mentions the ādhipāla-pratibhūs as sureties

(Continued

The documents in the Lekhapaddhati indicate that deeds were drafted with a view to emphasising the prerogatives of the creditor, but there is hardly anything protecting the debtor from exploitation. The documents generally contain a phrase meaning that whatever is written in them is to be regarded as authoritative even if an additional word is inserted or a word is wanting. We can well realise the implication of this for the poor and often uneducated debtor unable to make out the contents of the deed. In the Kuttanīmata[1] we read of a money-lender who used to write ten times the amount lent. The documents in the Lekhapaddhati[2] emphasise the duty of the debtor to repay on or before a certain date, after which the creditor could sell the mortgaged property to recover the amount due. It is stated that the debtor was to pay the money without creating any

---

Continued)
(LP, pp. 37f) other documents refer to the pratibhūs as fulfilling the same duties (LP, pp. 39, 34f). It would therefore follow that in some documents the expression ādhipāla has been added before pratibhū only to make the sense of their guaranteeing the mortgage more clear, as has been done in one case by adding dāna before pratibhū (LP, pp.36f) so as to emphasise the responsibility of the surety to pay the money. The Smrticandrikā (II.150) also quotes Pitāmaha to indicate that ādhipāla was a surety.

1. v. 746.
2. pp. 19-21, 36-39.

quarrel and without making any fuss. The debtor or his sureties were not to file a suit against the creditor. Obviously this could have been only a pious wish as the document itself goes on to consider the possibility of a suit being filed in a court of law. If the mortgaged property was destroyed by a natural calamity the debtor or his sureties were not to indulge in annoying discussions and controversies. In one of the documents it is laid down that if the mortgaged house collapsed or got damaged in any manner the mortgagee could get it repaired and add the expenses to the original loan.[1] If the mortgagee had any need for his money even before the due date of payment he could sell the property. In case the mortgaged chattel was damaged or depreciated through a natural calamity the mortgagor was to replace it by another one. This is corroborated by the Mitākṣarā[2] which observes that it is the duty of the mortgagor to take proper care of the pledged property. The debtor had to make up the amount if the proceeds of the sale of the pledged property were not sufficient. The Mitākṣarā[3] also lays down that if the income from a pledged property is not sufficient to meet the interest wholly the debtor has to

---

1. pp. 36-37.
2. On Yāj., II.60.
3. On Yāj., II.64.

pay the principal and the unpaid part of the interest before regaining his pledge.

Besides the different kinds of mortgages or pledges documented in the Lekhapaddhati we have one instance of what may be called hypothecation without possession.[1] Here a man borrows 20 measures of wheat with the stipulation that after the threshing season he would repay 25 measures of wheat. Though the creditor did not possess the field or grains of the debtor it is clear that a charge was created on the standing crops of the debtor. From the definition of bandha given in the Vyavahāra-mayūkha[2] it is clear that this was the same as hypothecation without possession. It is explained as an undertaking by the debtor that he will not alienate by sale, gift or mortgage his house, land or other property until the debt due to the creditor is paid off.

The Lekhapaddhati documents provide significant evidence for the law concerning sub-mortgages. We have two deeds of usufructuary mortgage of buildings of which one lays down that the mortgagee could not sub-mortgage the building by transferring the deed to a new mortgagee.[3] As the other document does

---

1. p. 21.
2. p. 166.
3. pp. 37-38.

not specifically deny the mortgagee the right to sub-mortgage[1] it would appear that normally the right vested with the mortgagee unless specifically stated otherwise. This is actually what the legal works of the period would indicate. The practice of sub-mortgage, though known from an early time, appears to have been recognised rather late.[2] Thus Medhātithi observes that the usufructuary rights of a mortgagee do not create in him the right to sub-mortgage.[3] Kullūka however opposes the interpretation of Medhātithi and adds that it is common practice in all countries for a mortgagee to execute a sub-mortgage of land and the like.[4] Here we see a change in law obviously necessitated by the demand for capital. The Parāśaramādhavīya[5] lays down further details about the sub-mortgage. It provides that a sub-mortgage can be made only when the amount due has risen to double the principal, but that if the owner consents a sub-mortgage may be made even before that contingency arises.

In order to induce the money-lender to invest his money in the disturbed economy of the period it was necessary that he should have some incentive in the form of greater profits.

---

1. pp. 36-37.
2. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.429.
3. On Manu VIII.143.
4. Ibid.
5. III p. 242.

It appears that the money-lenders sometimes found out ways of exceeding the interest permissible under law. Significantly the legal texts appear to recognise and sanction them by taking cognisance of them. Thus Medhātithi[1] mentions two customs which were incongrous with the strict Smṛti law on the point : (a) in some countries grains are lent out during the Spring, and double the quantity is realised during the Autumn and (b) the enjoyment of an usufructuary mortgage remains unchanged even after the total value of the produce so enjoyed is equal to the double the original debt. The Vivādaratnākara[2] condemns taking of interest in excess of the prescribed rates but admits that if a Shylock insists on his agreement he can and does recover compound interest and the like. Following Kātyāyana it further observes that if the debtor himself offers a rate of interest higher than the prescribed one, that will be admissible, though not one imposed by the creditor by force.[3] Medhātithi[4] follows the Smṛtis in laying down special rates of maximum interest but allows them upon the profits gained by the debtor with the loan. The Mitākṣarā[5] likewise supports the rate of 10 % and 20 % per month respectively from merchants traversing dense forests and sea-

---

1. On Manu VIII.3.
2. ∅ p. 14.
3. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.421f.
4. On Manu VIII.151-52.
5. On Yāj., II.38.

faring traders. The law-books had to admit exceptions to the general rule that whatever the rate of interest and the period of loan the creditor could not realise more than double the principal. Thus the Mitākṣarā[1] recognises that if interest is received every day, month or year and is not claimed in a lump sum at one time the total interest received by a creditor may even be several times more than the principal lent. A document in the Lekhapaddhati[2] gives a practical instance of how the money-lenders used to avoid the old rule of the debt not increasing beyond double of the principal. The present deed recording the mortgage of a mango-garden was drafted when the original loan together with the accumulated interest had become the double of the principal. The legal writers of the period justify the total interest exceeding the principal in case of certain commodities. Thus Medhātithi[3] supports eight-fold interest in the case of liquor as an exception to the general rule. Likewise the Vivādaratnākara[4] justifies and explains higher interests - eight-fold in the case of oils, liquors, ghee, raw-sugar and salt, five-fold in the case of metals other

---

1. On Yāj., II.39.
2. pp. 34-35.
3. On Manu VIII.140.
4. pp. 17-19.

than gold and silver and also in case of seeds.

With such increasing demands on capital, it could not possibly be allowed to lie idle or unproductive. Thus the Madanaratna[1], a little late in date, lays down rates of interest even in cases where no interest is settled beforehand and where the texts do not specify the rate, implying also loans through friendship, deposit, balance of interest and unpaid purchase money.

The legal works try to maintain the traditional rates of interest. Thus Lakṣmīdhara[2] and Caṇḍeśvara[3] approve the traditional rate of 1/80 th of the principal per month on secured debts and of 2 % per month on loans without pledge or mortgage. Medhātithi[4] observes that the higher rates of 2, 3, 4 and 5 per cent per month laid down by Manu for brāhmaṇa, kṣatriya, vaiśya and śūdra debtors are for a money-lender who cannot maintain himself at the rate of 1¼ % or has only a small capital, or where the borrower is not a righteous person. Al-Bīrūnī also refers to 2 per cent per month as the permissible rate of interest.[5] In all the Lekhapaddhati documents which specify

---

1. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.427.
2. Kṛtyakalpataru, Gṛhasthakāṇḍa, pp. 217-19.
3. Gṛhastharatnākara, pp. 446-47.
4. On Manu VIII.142.
5. II.150.

rate of interest we have it as 2 % per month.[1] In actual practice there must have been wide variation depending upon the needs and status of the two parties and stability of the area. In the mathematical text Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha[2] the rates vary between 1¼ % and 13⅓ % per month though those between 2 % and 6 % are predominant. In the Bījagaṇita[3] the rates range between 1 % and 10 % per month whereas the Līlāvatī[4] has them between 3 % and 5 % per month. Many inscriptions from Cāhamāna dominions indicate that generally the rate of interest per annum was 30 % though in some cases it may have been 33⅓ %.[5] In two inscriptions from Jalor a temple of Mahāvīra is said to have paid interest at the rate of 12 % and 10 % per annum. The lower rates of interest in these cases have rightly been explained on the assumption that the temple with its high credit among rich Jain followers had no need to attract fresh deposits by higher rates of interest.[6]

That deeds of credit were in frequent use in the period would follow from the space devoted in the Lekhapaddhati to the forms of these deeds. The Vyavahārapatra (deed of debt)

---

1. pp. 19-21, 33, 38, 55.
2. IV.33-V.78½.
3. pp. 232-248.
4. pp. 31-37.
5. D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p. 301.
6. Ibid.

recorded loans contracted on the personal security of a surety. In hastākṣarāṇi the debtor himself acknowledged the debt though sureties are also mentioned. The sanmukha-hastākṣarāṇi recorded loans contracted without any security. Loans on the pledge of chattels are recorded under ādhau kṛta vastūnāmupari gṛhītadravya-patra-vidhi. Ādhipatra was a deed of mortgage. Aśvāḍḍāṇakapatra, gṛhāḍḍāṇakapatra and kṣetrāḍḍāṇakapatra were deeds for mortgaging horses, houses and fields respectively. Vṛddhiphalabhogapatra recorded an unsufructuary mortgage. In valitapatra-vidhi the produce of the mortgage itself paid off the debt in course of time. Gṛhaḍūlipatram recorded the mortgage of a house which was lost to the debtor if he did not pay the money within the prescribed period. Vṛddhidhānyākṣarāṇi recorded the loan of grain to be paid together with interest in the form of grain. The examples of bills of exchange in the Lokaprakāśa were no doubt revised in the Muslim period, but we can fairly believe that the types enumerated go back to the time of Kṣemendra. The Lokaprakāśa[1] mentions bills of exchange (huṇḍikā) for cash, for rice, for barley and wheat, for wine (sevya), for purchase (kriyākāra)[2] and for horses (goṭikā)[3]. It also refers to cīrikās

---

1. p. 13.
2. Here kriya seems to have been used in the sense of kraya. See also ibid., vīriya-kriyākāra-cīrikā.
3. Ibid., p. 19 vv. 1-3 indicate that goṭikā is a mistake for ghoṭaka.

or rememberances which were used as deeds acknowledging debts etc (ujjāmacīrikā). Significantly enough the expression ujjāmapatrikā in this very sense (dhanadhāraṇapatrikā) appears in the Samayamātṛkā[1] of Kṣemendra. The story in this text indicates that such deeds acknowledging debts received had become a regular feature of society. Here a courtesan asks the son of a merchant to sign such a deed for her. The Lokaprakāśa[2] mentions these for cash, rice and pledges (bandha). In recognition of the importance of the letters of credit Damodara devotes the fifth prakaraṇa of his Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa to a discussion of their rules and forms. Unfortunately the portions of his own commentary on this section of his book has not been recovered otherwise we could have used them for corroborating the Lekhapaddhati.

It is difficult to say how far this increased use of letters of credit arose from the paucity of coins in the period. It is however likely that dangers on the road led traders especially those engaged in inter-state trade not to carry much cash.

Until very recent times the average Indian has often been inclined to contract loans for unproductive purposes. That conditions in our period were not very different would appear

---

1. VIII.95-96.
2. p. 13.

from the definitions of the law-books of the period of a vyāvahārika debt and its opposite. Thus the Smṛticandrikā and the Vyavahāraprakāśa give an example of the latter as a debt contracted to pay for drinking wine. Aparārka explains vyāvahārika as a just debt (nyāyyam) and the Bālambhaṭṭī takes it to mean one useful for the family.[1] It would thus appear that in explaining vyāvahārika the law-writers were not thinking of commercial activities but of the needs of the family. Loans of clothes, grain, gold, liquor and other articles would appear to have been contracted for consumption.[2] It is however not suggested that loans for economic purposes were not recognised by the legal texts. We have already referred to the views of the Mitākṣarā[3] on loans contracted by merchants. Medhātithi also takes into consideration the possibility of the debtor growing opulent with the wealth earned from borrowed grain and of the debtor carrying on an extensive business with capital lent to him.[4] In the commentary of Asahāya we read of a merchant taking a loan of ten thousand drammas.[5] Two problems in the Gaṇitasāra-saṅgraha[6] refer to people borrowing money to lend it out at

---

1. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.447.
2. Cf. Medhātithi on Manu VIII.140.
3. On Yāj., II.38.
4. On Manu VIII.151-52.
5. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.289f, f.n. 395.
6. IV.55-56.

higher rates. The Lekhapaddhati can be made to yield valuable information on the uses of the credit system. A majority of its documents records loans contracted by householders[1] or even state officials[2], in most cases by mortgaging their fields, houses, horses and cattle. But instances are not wanting where a merchant is said to have contracted the loan.[3] In all the documents, irrespective of the fact as to who is the debtor, we have a stock expression meaning that the loan was contracted for a work or need of his which had arisen.[4] But it goes without saying that in the case of a merchant the need was not always for family requirements. It is significant that in one of the documents a merchant borrows 20 measures of wheat with the stipulation to pay 25 measures of wheat at the end of the threshing season.[5] One document, which has been placed with others concerning credits but which is not strictly a case of loan, refers to a son of a merchant borrowing money from his father out of his own share of the ancestral property; this records that the son took five hundred drammas for doing the business of lending money.[6]

Referring to the stigma attached to usury Al-Bīrūnī obser-

---

1. pp. 36-7, 35, 34, 39, 43.
2. pp. 19-21.
3. pp. 21, 38, 42, 37-8, 33.
4. Svakāryavaśāt; sviyasamutpannaprayojanavaśāt.
5. p. 21.
6. p. 56.

ved that it is allowed only to the śūdra and even in his case only as long as the profit does not exceed two per cent per month.[1] However it does not appear that the caste restriction was so strictly respected. A story narrated by the commentator Asahāya speaks of a brāhmaṇa who lent money to a trader.[2] The change of attitude on the part of the law-writers towards money-lending, no doubt resulting from its increased utility for the times, is reflected in the fact that Lakṣmīdhara[3] chooses to quote Bṛhaspati who mentions money-lending as the best means of livelihood for the higher castes. In all the credit deeds in the Lekhapaddhati the creditor is always a merchant who significantly enough is always introduced as one who invests his money for the sake of interest. We have already referred to the document in which the son of a merchant takes five hundred drammas from his share of the ancestral property to use in the business of money-lending (uddhārya-vyavahārārtham).[4] Money-lending would appear to have been one of the major activities of a merchant (vaṇik).[5] There were people who regularly lent out money on interest. From the Bījagaṇita[6] of Bhāskarācārya we

---

1. ~~xxxx~~ II.150.
2. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III.289f, f.n. 395.
3. Kṛtyakalpataru, Gārhasthyakāṇḍa, p. 221.
4. p. 56.
5. Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa, p. 14 l. 20 - vaṇije dhanaṃ dhārayate.
6. pp. 232, 241.

learn of the interest from an earlier loan being again lent out.

Medhātithi[1] has a very interesting reference indicating the development in the credit system of the period. It speaks of a man promising to another man to pay him a certain amount of money through a merchant and sending a messenger to notify the latter of this; the payment could not be made on account of the banker's absence or some other reason. It is clear that the man sent to the merchant some form of letter of credit. The reference would suggest a free circulation of money through the frequent use of letters of credit. It is not clear from the reference as to what was the basis of the confidence on the part of the merchant in the man seeking payment through him. Obviously in such a case there could not have been any reliance on a pledge or surety. Can we construe the passage to imply that the merchant served as some sort of a banking institution and the man who had deposits with him or had earned his confidence in some other manner could borrow money out of his own deposit or otherwise, to be paid later on ?

The modern institution of banking is a highly complex system evolving out of a combination of the two correlated practices of depositing and lending money. To suggest the

---

1. On Manu VIII.159 - Aham amuṣmādvaṇija etasyeyaddēpaye iti tatra tu manuṣye preṣite kathaṃciddātumaghaṭite'saṃnidhānād vaṇijo'nyato'pi kāraṇāt....

existence of banking in all its details in our period would be an injustice to the availabe evidence. But some form of a rudimentary system of banking is suggested in some references. Over and above the system of loans contracted on the basis of pledges or mortgages we find in some cases the practice of borrowing money from time to time on a deposit which had been made earlier. Thus we read in the Kuṭṭanīmata[1] that the maid servant of a courtesan deposited with a merchant and received 30 kedaras; she took 30 kedaras a second time and also camphor, saffron, sandal and incense from time to time. In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] we read of a man who deposited a lac of dīnāras with a merchant and for some 20 or 30 years took from him from time to time money to meet his expenses. It has however to be emphasised that in both these cases the merchant with whom the deposit was made was to treat it as a trust or pledge without using it himself and the depositor was not to receive anything by way of interest from it. But we must also note that in the Rājataraṅgiṇī the merchant was made to pay interest on the deposit because it was found that he had been using it. It would therefore follow that if the merchant-banker used the money of the deposit he had to pay interest on it. But, as we shall

---

1. vv. 605-9.
2. VIII.123-158.

see, merchants generally accepted deposits as pledges or trusts and were not expected to use them or pay interest on them.

We notice a significant change as regards collective banking in this period. We have very few references to guilds in northern India accepting deposits or endowments and paying regular periodical interest on them. Thus we read in the Siyadoni inscription of 912 A.D.[1] that 1350 Śrīmadādivarāha-drammas denated by a merchant named Nāgāka were invested with the distillers of spirituous liquor. The reason for the paucity of such references is to be sought in the disturbed conditions of the time. It is also likely that the frequent migration of population from one place to another that resulted from the interminable wars of the period did not leave the guilds stable and permanently established in one place. The definite down-grading of industrial labour which we find in the period also affected the status of the guilds.[2] In some Cāhamāna records we find temples accepting endowments and paying interest on them.[3] It is likely that the sanctity attached to the property of a temple must have led people to find more stability in the temples than in other bodies.

---

1. E.I., I.173ff.
2. See supra pp. 142-3.
3. D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p. 301.

In India the average man does not think much in terms of employing his surplus for further gains. His main concern is to have his money safe. This explains the popularity of the practice of hoarding money in India. In the Dhūrtaviṭasaṁvāda[1] wealth is said to have only three courses open for it - gift, consumption and hoarding. Here hoarding is criticised, but it is clear from the reference that it prevailed widely in society. In the stories we often read of people chancing to find hoarded money.[2] Khanyavāda was the science of determining the location of hidden treasures.[3] The Mānasollāsa[4] requires the king to find out hoards from various signs.

Under such circumstances the safe custody of deposits was in itself a great obligation. As the bailee did not receive any advantages from the deposit it must have been only a pious duty for him to protect it.[5] It may be easily realised that it would have been difficult to find a willing bailee, especially in a period of political insecurity like the one we are studying. It was with a view to encourage people to accept deposits that the law-writers of the period granted favourable rules to

---

1. Caturbhāṇi, II p. 24.
2. Upamitibhavaprapañcā, pp. 865, 957; Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 56 l. 20. Also ibid., p. 36 l. 8.
3. Upamitibhavaprapañcā, p. 60; Aparājitapṛcchā, p.122 vv.39-42.
4. I p. 59 vv. 333-61.
5. Cf. Kuṭṭanīmata, v. 455.

the bailee. Thus we find from Haradatta[1] that sons were not liable for the misappropriation or loss of a deposit or bailment made to their father or other ancestor provided that they themselves had not joined or helped in the embezzlement or loss. Likewise ~~it~~ the Vivādaratnākara[2] observes that in case the deposit is not sealed and the bailee uses it for some time and then replaces it, no blame or liability attaches to him.

For deposit three terms used rather loosely are nyāsa, nikṣepa and upanidhi. The Mitākṣarā[3] explains nikṣepa as deposits counted in the presence of the depositary, nyāsa as handing over in the absence of the head of the house and upanidhi as a deposit sealed in the presence of the depositee but without being counted. It appears that there was much confusion as regards the precise significance of these three terms. Thus the Abhidhānaratnamālā[4] uses nikṣepa and upanidhi in the same sense. The Vaijayantī[5] also mentions nyāsa, upanidhi, sthāpya and nikṣepa as synonyms. Kṣīrasvāmin[6] explains upanidhi and nyāsa as an open deposit and nikṣepa as the delivery of some goods to a craftsman for being worked up. The legal works of

---

1. On Gautama XII.39.
2. pp. 86-87.
3. On Yāj., II.67; Vyavahāraprakāśa, p. 280.
4. v. 82.
5. p. 124, l. 24.
6. On Amara II.9.81.

the period also reflect this uncertainty about the true import of these terms. As against the Mitākṣarā, Viśvarūpa[1] takes nyāsa to mean an open deposit for safe custody and nikṣepa as the delivery of one's article for handing over to a third party. In the Samayamātṛkā[2], in connection with a deposit of jewels in a sealed box, the words nikṣepa and nyāsa are used indiscriminately. In literary references nyāsa is the term generally used and implies a sacred trust to be protected but not to be enjoyed by the depositary.[3] Upanidhi was sometimes used as a general term for a deposit.[4] It would appear that the deposit called nikṣepa could be used by the depositary.[5]

In this period the merchants appear regularly to have received deposits. Nikṣepa-vaṇikas or merchants accepting deposits are referred to in the Naiṣadhīyacarita.[6] Kṣemendra refers to the social type of a merchant who turns deaf when approached for the recovery of property deposited with him[7] and becomes opulent by confiscating deposits made with him.[8] Kalhaṇa records a story of a merchant refusing to return a

---

1. On Yāj., II.69.
2. VIII.65, 87.
3. Kuṭṭanīmata, v.455; Prabandhacintāmani, p. 95, l.20.
4. Prabandhacintāmani, p. 108 ll. 8-9.
5. Cf. Kumārasambhava, V.13.
6. III.43.
7. Samayamātṛkā, V.53-58.
8. Deśopadeśa, VIII.14; Narmamālā, III.71; Kalāvilāsa, II.4, 23-24.

deposit and observes, "A merchant in a law-suit relating to the embezzlement of a deposit is more to be dreaded than a tiger; because he shows a face smooth as oil, uses his voice but very little and shows a gentle appearance"[1]. Elsewhere also he exposes the hypocrite merchants who having embezzled deposits show themselves ever eager to listen to the recital of sacred texts[2]. The combined testimony of Kalhaṇa and Kṣemendra indicates that the dishonesty of the deceitful merchants was quite a normal phenomenon. Obviously it must have seriously affected the credit system of the period.

---

1. Rāj., VIII.123-160.
2. Ibid., 706-710.

CHAPTER I - COINAGE SYSTEM

The coins of the early medieval period have so far not received a systematic and comprehensive analysis and study. There is no catalogue covering all these coins and after Cunningham's book in 1894 there have been only occasional discussions about some isolated points.

As against the originality, artistic excellence and wide variety found in the coin-types of the Gupta period, those in our period are restricted in number and with a few exceptions there is no newness or originality about them. These types are imitations of older ones and are very crude in execution.

The coins of the early medieval period afford a poor substitute for the coins of the earlier period even in respect of their weights. Now the coins follow a definitely lighter weight standard. Whereas in the earlier period the gold coins weighed 120 grains and tended to approximate to 146 grains those of our period generally weigh in the neighbourhood of 60 grains. A similar depreciation of weight can be noticed in the case of silver and copper coins also.

This is not to imply that the coins of this period had no weight-scheme to follow. A careful analysis reveals that they were made to approximate to some regular and definite weight standard. We can discern two parallel systems in these coins. Most of the coins seem to be based on the standard of a Greek

drachma weighing 67.5 grains. It appears that not only the silver coins but also the gold and copper coins of most of the dynasties of our period followed the weight standard of the drachma. Another widely prevalent weight scheme appears to have followed the weight prescribed for the traditional denomination purāṇa which weighed 32 raktīs or 58.56 grains.

According to Cunningham[1] the silver coins of the Indo-Sassanian type generally weigh upwards of 60 grains. In the coins illustrated by him we find a typical Indo-Sassanian piece of silver weighing 65 grains[2], whereas a similar copper piece weighs 66 grains[3]. Bidyabinod[4] gives 41.3 grains as the minimum and 61.7 grains as the maximum of these coins. The coins of the Piplaj hoard made of impure silver considerably alloyed with copper and lead have 61 grains as their average weight.[5] The weight of silver pieces catalogued by Smith[6] under the north-western type ranges between 52.6 and 64 grains, mostly approximating to 63 and 58 grains, and pieces less than 56 grains are few in number. The flat pieces of gadhaiyā coins catalogued by him weigh between 61 and 64.2 grains whereas the

---

1. C.M.I., pp. 47f.
2. Ibid., p.53 no.7.
3. Ibid., no.8.
4. Supp. Cat. Ind. Museum, I.59.
5. J.N.S.I., VII.98, 100.
6. C.C.I.M., I pp.237-39.

thick transitional pieces are between 59.7 and 63.8. Thick dummy pieces of silver in the gadhaiyā variety appear to have a tendency towards over weight being between 62.3 and 74.5 grains, but the copper pieces weigh between 52.2 and 65 grains.[1] Among the gadhaiyā pieces with the legend Oṃkāra noticed by H.V.Trivedi the silver ones vary in weight between 61 and 65 grains, whereas the two copper coins weigh 60 and 45 grains.[2] The silver pieces with the legend Śrī Vi or Śrī Vigra catalogued by Smith as forming the eastern or Magadha type are found to weigh between 52.7 and 60 grains.[3] But among the coins of this type illustrated by Cunningham[4] we see that a copper piece weighs 65 grains, while a silver one weighs 62 grains. As regards the pieces with the Ādivarāha type we find that the silver coins illustrated by Cunningham[5] weighs 62 grains. The copper coins of this type catalogued by Smith weigh 61 and 57.9 grains whereas the silver ones range between 51.9 and 63.4 grains.[6] The coins of Vināyakapāladeva are found to weigh between 62 and 69 grains.[7] Cunningham gives 65 grains as the weight of the silver coins with the legend Śrī Somala deva. According to

---

1. Ibid., pp.240f.
2. J.N.S.I., XIII.205.
3. C.C.I.M., I pp.239f.
4. C.M.I., p.54 nos. 15, 16.
5. Ibid., no. 20.
6. C.C.I.M., I pp.241f.
7. J.N.S.I., X.29.

him the copper coins of this king have the horseman device on them and are in three sizes of 65, 33 and 17 grains.[1] The copper coins with the legend Śrī Tri-vi are found weighing 16 and 19 grains.[2]

It becomes clear from the above that the Indo-Sassanian coins of copper and silver alike were intended to approximate to the weight 67.5 grains. Coins recorded as weighing more than this standard are few in number. Generally there is a depreciation of some 7 grains in the weight of the coins which may also be regarded as excusable, because anything nearing perfection is neither seen nor expected in the coins of ancient times. It is however equally possible that the depreciation in some cases was deliberate, especially where we find that the coins weigh some 12 grains less than their standard. We would suggest that the pieces weighing in the neighbourhood of 50.62 grains were intended to pass as three-fourths of the standard coins. Likewise it would appear from some pieces weighing 33 and 17 grains that there were half (33.75 grains) and one-fourth (16.87) denominations of this weight standard.

The silver coins of Spalapatideva of the Śāhi family of Ohind weigh between 45.3 and 54 grains, whereas the weight of

---

1. C.W.I., p.53.
2. Ibid., pp. 54f.

the copper pieces ranges between 38.8 and 45 grains.[1] The silver coins of Sāmantadeva catalogued by Smith weigh between 45.2 and 51.2 grains.[2] But Cunningham illustrates two silver coins which weigh 50 and 33 grains. As regards his copper coins with the humped bull and horseman device Smith catalogues pieces weighing between 45.4 and 54.2 grains, whereas copper coins of the elephant and lion type range between 30.7 and 37.5 grains.[3] According to Cunningham[4] the latter type is found on coins of three sizes weighing about 42, 14 and 7 grains. Likewise, in the case of the copper coins of Vakkadeva, whereas Smith records pieces ranging between 29.1 and 39.1 grains,[5] Cunning-ham mentions these coins as being of three sizes 52, 42 and 18 grains.[6] The silver coins of Aśatapāla recorded by Smith[7] weigh 45 and 45.5 and his copper pieces illustrated by Cunningham[8] are 48 grains in weight. The silver pieces of Khudavayaka noticed by Smith[9] range between 44.5 and 49.7 grains. The silver and copper coins of Bhīmadeva respectively weigh

---

1. C.C.I.M., I pp.246f.
2. Ibid., p. 247.
3. C.C.I.M., I p.248.
4. C.M.I., p. 64.
5. C.C.I.M., I pp. 248f.
6. C.M.I., pp. 62f.
7. C.C.I.M., I p. 249.
8. C.M.I., p. 65.
9. C.C.I.M., I p. 249.

50 and 24 grains[1]. The solitary coin of Kamara weighs 30.3 grains[2].

An analysis of these weights would indicate that the coins of the Sahi kings did not follow the weight scheme of a drachma but in the case of copper and silver pieces alike were made to approximate to the weight of a purāṇa or 58.56 grains. But these coins were depreciated in weight. They are not found weighing more than 54.2 grains and often are 52, 50, 48 or 45 grains, which indicates that the depreciation ranged between 4 and 13 grains. Pieces weighing 42 grains or even 33, 37, 38 or 39 grains can be recognised as three-fourths of the standard weight (43.92) with a depreciation of 2 to 11 grains, but the weight 33 grains is found only for a solitary piece. Coins weighing 30.7, 30.3 or 29.1 grains are to be treated as one-half pieces (29.58). Coins weighing 24 and 18 grains are also to be classed as one-half pieces with a depreciation of 5 and 11 grains. Coins weighing 14 and 7 grains can clearly be recognised respectively as one-fourth (14.79) and one-eighth (7.39) of the standard coins.

The gold coins of Gāṅgeyadeva generally weigh about 60

---

1. C.M.I., pp. 64f.
2. Ibid., p.62.

grains.[1] V.V.Mirashi illustrates one of his gold coins weighing 61 grains.[2] According to Cunningham[3] his gold coins weigh 62, 30 or 14 grains. The gold coins of Gāṅgeyadeva catalogued by Smith[4] range between 59.3 and 63 grains andx there are solitary pieces weighing 14.6 and 5.6 grains. The top weight of his gold coins in the Lucknow Museum is 65 grains. It is clear that these gold coins follow the weight prescribed for a drachma. The depreciation in their weight ranges between 2.5 and 8.2 grains, usually some 6 grains. The pieces weighing 30, 14 or 5.6 grains are to be regarded respectively as one-half (33.75), one-fourth (16.87) and one-eighth (8.43) denominations. It would appear that the silver and copper coins of Gāṅgeyadeva also follow the weight standard for a drachma. Thus Cunningham[5] mentions his silver coins as weighing 61 and 7 grains, which may be taken to correspond to the weight of a drachma and its one-eighth. Cunningham[6] gives 61 grains as the weight of the copper coins of Gāṅgeyadeva. The three copper pieces noted by Smith[7] weigh 59.2, 48.7 and 48.3 grains. In this case we find

---

1. J.N.S.I., XVIII.110-11.
2. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxii.
3. C.M.I., p. 72.
4. C.C.I.M., I p. 252.
5. C.M.I., p. 72.
6. Ibid.
7. C.C.I.M., I p. 253.

not only a piece having the weight of a drachma but also one of three-fourths (50.62) that weight.

The Candella kings, who borrowed the coin-type started by Gangeyadeva, also adopted the weight-standard of the latter's coins. The gold coins of Kīrtivarman approximate to 63 or 31 grains and thus are to be recognised as being equal in weight respectively to a drachma and its half.[1] Smith[2] catalogues two gold coins of Madanavarman weighing 62.2 and 62.3 grains and one weighing 15.6 grains. These clearly approximate to the weight respectively f of a drachma and its one-fourth. Eighty gold coins of Madanavarman found in the Rewa State weigh between 13.16 and 16.07 grains[3] and are equal to one-fourth of a drachma. The reign of Paramardi is represented by a solitary gold piece weighing 61.4 grains[4] and obviously intended to represent the weight of a drachma. The gold coins of Sallakṣaṇa are of two types according as their weight approximates to those of a drachma or a quarter drachma. His copper coins also have a weight approximating to a drachma. For the reign of

---

1. I.A., XXXVII pp. 147f.
2. C.C.I.M., I p. 253.
3. J.A.S.B., N.S. XXII.131. There is a solitary silver coin of Madanavarman in the collection of Mr. Hoey which weighs equal to the quarter of a drachma. But it is not unlikely that like many gold pieces of the Candellas very heavily alloyed with silver the present piece was officially intended to pass as being of gold.
4. J.A.S.B., 1889, p. 34.

Jayavarman we have copper coins weighing 60 grains which were most likely intended to correspond to the weight of a drachma. A.S.Altekar[1] mentions a solitary copper piece of Jayavarman weighing 30 grains and hence representing a half of the standard weight. The copper coins of Pṛthvīvarman also correspond to the weight standard of a drachma. One of his copper coins ~~which~~ which weighs 16.2 grains can be easily recognised as representing one-quarter of the weight of a drachma. For the reign of Trailokyavarman we have gold and copper coins alike approximating to the weight of a drachma. Vīravarman is represented by two gold coins weighing respectively 62.5[2] and 46[3] grains. We can easily recognise in these pieces the weight standard of a drachma and its three-fourths (50.62). The above survey makes it clear that the coins of the Candellas, irrespective of their metal, were made to approximate to the weight standard of a drachma, though they usually show a depreciation of some 5 to 7 grains.

The coins of the Kalacuris of S.Kosala reveal two different weight standards. The two gold coins of Jājalladeva

---

1. J.N.S.I., V.33. A silver coin ? of Jayavarman noticed by Cunningham in the collection of the British Museum is not traceable now.
2. C.C.I.M., I p.254.
3. J.N.S.I., XVI.236-8.

illustrated by V.V.Mirashi[1] weigh 61 and 15.5 grains. These can be recognised as approximating to the weight of a drachma and its one-fourth. But the coins catalogued by Smith[2] range either between 56.3 and 59.9 or between 13.3 and 14 grains. Thus the maximum depreciation in the two series would be respectively 11.2 and 3.57 grains. The gold coins of Ratnadeva noticed by V.V.Mirashi[3] weigh 62 and 15.5 grains. But Smith[4] catalogues one piece weighing 60.5 grains and others ranging between 12.5 and 13.0 grains. Thus the maximum depreciation in the gold coins of Ratnadeva works out as 7 and 4.37 grains. The gold coins of Pṛthvīdeva also follow the weight standard of a drachma. V.V.Mirashi[5] illustrates two gold coins of this king weighing respectively 61 and 15 grains. But Smith[6] catalogues only pieces approximating to the weight of a drachma and ranging between 59 and 60.2 grains thus indicating a maximum depreciation of 8.87 grains. But the copper coins of the Kalacuris of S.Kosala are difficult to fit into the weight standard of a drachma. The copper coin of Jājalladeva illustrated by V.V. Mirashi weighs 43.5 grains.[7] The two copper coins of Ratnadeva

---

1. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxv.
2. C.C.I.M., I pp. 254f.
3. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxvi.
4. C.C.I.M., I p. 255.
5. C.I.I., IV pp. clxxxvi-vii.
6. C.C.I.M., I p. 254.
7. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxv.

weigh 100 and 23.5 grains.[1] The four pieces of Pṛthvīdeva are found to weigh 99.5, 68, 99.5 and 73 grains.[2] The two coins of Pratāpamalla weigh 38 and 29 grains.[3] These copper coins seem to have been based on the standard weight of a karṣa or 80 raktikas or 146.4 grains laid down for a paṇa.[4] It is significant that there is no piece corresponding to the full weight of a paṇa. This is typical of the coins of this period, which reveal considerable depreciation, most likely deliberately made. The coins weighing 100 and 99.5 may be regarded as the three-fourths of a paṇa (109.8) with a depreciation of 9.8 grains; those weighing 73 and 68 grains are to be taken as one-half of a paṇa (73.2); the 43.5 and 38 grains pieces to be one-third of a paṇa (48.8), those of 29 grains to be one-fourth of a paṇa (36.6) and those of 23.5 grains to be one-sixth of a paṇa (24.4). The only king of the family who seems to have struck silver coins is Pṛthvīdeva. But even these are very rare and Mr. L.P.Pandeya has so far been able to secure only three of them.[5] One piece illustrated by V.V.Mirashi[6] weighs only 6

---

1. Ibid., p. clxxxvi.
2. Ibid., p. clxxxvi-vii.
3. Ibid., p. clxxxvii.
4. The suggestion seems to receive support from the fact that the Kaman Stone Inscription (E.I., XXIV.335) seems to use paṇa as the term for a copper coin.
5. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxvii.
6. Ibid., p. clxxxvi (no. 14 in Plate A).

grains, which was probably intended to pass as one-eighth of the standard piece of weight equal to a drachma.

An analysis of the Gāhaḍavāla coins also indicates the use of two different weight standards, the purāṇa standard of weight for silver and copper coins and the drachma standard for the gold coins. The reason for this differenciation is to be found in the prototypes of these two series. The silver and copper coins of the Gāhaḍavālas are of the horseman and bull type, ultimately derived from the coins of the Śāhi kings of Ohind which followed the purāṇa standard of weight. On the other hand, the gold coins of the Gāhaḍavālas are of the seated goddess type, and, being copied from the coins of Gāṅgeyadeva, adopt the weight standard of a drachma. The silver coin of Madanapāla catalogued by Smith[1] weighs 45.3 grains whereas his copper pieces range between 46.6 and 50 grains. The copper coins of Govindacandra noticed by Smith weigh 37, 40.7 and 49.3 grains. The depreciation in the case of the silver coin of Madanapāla is 13.26 grains while in the case of his copper coins it ranges between 11.96 to 8.56 grains. The copper coin of Govindacandra weighing 49.3 grains indicates a depreciation of 9.26 grains.

---

1. C.C.I.M., I pp. 260f.

His coins weighing 37 and 40.7 grains are to be regarded as three-fourths of the standard weight (43.92) thus showing a depreciation of 6.92 and 3.22 grains. The two gold coins of Govindacandra weigh 58.8 and 68 grains. These pieces can be taken to follow the weight standard of a drachma. The weight of these coins show a clear tendency to form two groups approximating to 68 and 61 grains. The first group may testify to an attempt on the part of the Gāhaḍavāla king to be faithful in following the weight standard whereas the second group indicates the regular tendency of depreciation in the coins of the period.

As regards their weight standard the coins of kings described by Cunningham and Smith as belonging to the Tomara dynasty unfold a tale similar to that of the coins of the Gāhaḍavāla kings. The copper coins of the dynasty follow the bull and horseman type not only in type but also in the weight scheme. and thus approximate to the weight standard of a purāṇa. Likewise the gold coins of the dynasty are of the seated goddess type, borrowed from the coins of Gāṅgeyadeva, whose drachma standard is also adopted by the coins of the Tomaras. The two copper coins of Sallakṣaṇapāla noticed by Smith[1] weigh 48.9 and 50.6 grains thus having a depreciation of respectively 9.66

---

1. C.C.I.M., I p. 259.

and 7.96 grains. The copper coins of Anaṅgapāla range between 45.7 and 50.2 grains mostly clustering round 50 grains with one piece weighing 43.7 grains. The coin weighing 43.7 grains may be regarded as representing three-fourths (43.92) of the standard weight of a purāṇa while the remainder were intended to approximate to a purana, with a depreciation ranging between 12.86 and 8.36 grains. The two copper coins of Mahīpāla[1] weigh 47.5 and 46 grains. They were also made after the purāṇa standard but the depreciation in these cases is 11.06 and 12.56 grains. On the other hand the gold coins of Kumārapāladeva weigh 61.7 and 62.7 grains.[2] We may take these as approximating to the weight standard of a drachma.

The copper and silver coins of the Cāhamānas also borrow the bull and horseman type started by the Ṣāhi kings of Ohind. The weight standard of these coins of the Cāhamānas also follows the weight standard used by the Ṣāhi kings i.e., a purāṇa weighing 58.56 grains. Thus the copper coins of Śmeśvara-deva noticed by Smith[3] weigh 41, 48.1, 50 and 52.7 grains. The last three appear to have been intended for a piece weighing a purāṇa whereas the first represented its three-fourths. In

---

1. Ibid., p. 260.
2. Ibid., p. 259.
3. Ibid., p. 261.

the case of the purāṇa pieces the depreciation ranges between 10.46 and 5.86 grains whereas in the case of the three-fourths piece it is only 2.92 grains. The copper coins of Pṛthvīrāja[1] approximate to the weight of a purāṇa more closely, ranging between 50.6 and 53.5, thus narrowing down the depreciation to between 7.96 and 5.06 grains. Only one piece has an unusually small weight of 47.4 grains with a depreciation of 11.16 grains. His ~~xxxx~~ silver coin illustrated by Smith and weighing 52 grains may be easily be regarded as following the weight standard for a purāṇa, with a depreciation of 6.56 grains.

The coins of the kings of Narwar including Malayavarman, a Pratihāra chief of the place, and the kings of the Jājpella dynasty follow the weight standard of a purāṇa. These coins are of the horseman and the bull type and the kings of Narwar seem to have borrowed the weight standard along with the coin-types from the Śāhi kings of Ohind. The three copper coins of Malayavarman noticed by Smith[2] ~~xxxx~~ weigh 57, 51.1 and 44 grains. The first two may be regarded as approximating to the weight of a purāṇa while the last one represents a three-quarter piece (43.92). The copper coins of Cāhaḍadeva approximate very closely to the standard weight of a purāṇa. The weights of his coins catalogued by Smith are 49.7, 51, 51.8, 53.5, 54.8, 54.9 and

---

1. Ibid., p. 262.
2. Ibid., p. 262.

57.5 grains.[1] It is clear that, leaving aside his three pieces approximating to 54 grains, most of his coins are in the vicinity of 54 grains, while one piece is almost identical in weight to the standard.

The bull and horseman type of coins with the names of Pīpala, Pithi (Pṛthvī) or Kīrtti[2] also adopt the standard for the weight of a purāṇa, most likely because the issuer of these coins borrowed the weight standard as well as the type from the coins of the Ṣāhi kings. Thus the copper coins of Pīpala weigh 52.1 and 52.4 grains while those of Pithi weigh 52 and 52.2 grains. The silver coin of Kīrtti weighs 50.5 grains. Thus the depreciation in these three types of coin ranges between 8.06 and 6.16 grains.

The copper coins with the Śiva and bull type are recovered mostly from East Punjab and Delhi area and are described by Cunningham as having circulated in the period between 500 and 800 A.D.[3] The weight as recorded by Smith in the case of some of these pieces is 58.4, 66.3, 70 and 78 grains. It is difficult to determine the weight scheme followed by these coins. The two latter weights, especially the last, would suggest

---

1. Ibid., pp. 262f.
2. Ibid., p. 263.
3. C.M.I., pp. 48f.

that these are not based on the drachma standard. We may suggest that as the device is to be traced to the coins of the Kuṣāṇa king Vasudeva, the present coins adopt their weight standard also, but the depreciation in the weight will have to be recognised as very wide. Another possibility is that these coins follow the traditional weight of a kārṣāpaṇa as 80 rattīs or 144 grains but were minted only to weigh half of its standard weight.

Stein has discussed the weight standard of the Kashmir coins very thoroughly. The coins with the name of Toramāṇa which initiate the typical coins of Kashmir of the early medieval period range between 83.8 and 111.5 grains, mostly clustering around 100 grains. The coins with the names of Pratāpāditya, Vinayāditya, Yaśovarman or Vigraha on them, which form a separate category because of the debasement of their device, have a higher upper limit, weighing from 83.8 to 123.5 grains. The long series of typical Kashmir coins of the period beginning with the reign of Śaṅkaravarman are lighter in weight, ranging between 71.5 and 97.5 grains.

x x x x x

The texts of our period having any bearing on the currency

---

1. Rāj., Vol. II, note H; Num. Chron., 1899.

system do not mention the ratio in the value of gold, silver and copper.[1] A.S.Altekar[2] has tried to determine the relative value of the three metals on the basis of the tables of coins. According to the Līlāvatī[3] of Bhāskarācārya 16 paṇas were equal to one dramma and 16 drammas were equal to one niṣka. The coin denominations paṇa, dramma and niṣka may be taken to refer respectively to copper, silver and gold coins. But the text does not mention the weight of the dramma and niṣka coins. So any calculation about the ratio in the value of gold and silver will be only tentative in nature. If we believe that both dramma and niṣka refer respectively to the silver and gold coins of early medieval period, which were equal in weight, being based on the weight of the drachma of the Attic standard, we can infer the ratio between gold and silver as having been 1:16. In the Jñāneśvarī[4], composed in 1290 A.D., we have a definite statement to the effect that gold is 15 times in price of the same weight of silver. It is interesting to compare this with the ratio between the two metals prevailing in earlier periods. On the basis of the reference in the Nasik

---

1. The Śukranīti IV.2.181-82 gives the relation as being 1 unit of gold=16 units of silver, and 1 unit of silver=80 units of copper.
2. J.N.S.I., II.1-14.
3. p. 1 no. 2.
4. XVII.322.

inscription of Uṣavadāta dated 120 A.D.[1] Rapson[2] calculated the ratio of gold and silver as 1:10. But the Baigram plate of the reign of Kumarāgupta I[3] makes 16 rūpakas equal to 1 dīnāra. The ratio between gold and silver would therefore be 1:8.[4] We have therefore to postulate, besides regional differences, fluctuations in the ratio in different periods. This much however is clear that gold in our period was dearer in relation to silver than in earlier periods. We do not know the precise reason for the increase in the value of gold. In the earlier period India received a considerable quantity of gold from its trade with the west, but this supply seems to have dwindled in the early medieval world.

In the Līlāvatī 16 copper paṇas are equated with one silver dramma. This equation is also supported by the Medinīkośa.[5] On the assumption that a silver dramma of our period weighs 50 grains (with an alloy of 20% the actual silver content is taken to be only 40 grains) and a copper paṇa 140 grains, A.S.Altekar[6] infers the ratio between silver and copper to be 1:56. But in case the copper paṇa of the Līlāvatī is taken to be equal to

---

1. Select Inscriptions, pp. 157ff.
2. Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, p. clxxxv. Bhandarkar, A.I.N., p. 192 calculated the ratio as 1:14.
3. E.I., XXI.81f.
4. S.K.Maity, Economic Life, p. 172. In the History of Bengal Vol. I pp. 665f it is calculated as 1:4.6.
5. Pa - dvika, v. 92.
6. J.N.S.I., II.13.

20 māṣas[1] and not 16 māṣas the ratio between the two metals turns out to be 1:70.[2] However, we do not know the precise weight of the copper and silver coins referred to in the Līlāvatī. It is not unlikely that the table in the Līlāvatī does not take into consideration the existing coins but simply mentions the traditional equations, only with the difference that it substitutes dramma for the earlier and more common purāṇa.[3] But we do not want to brush aside the possibility that the traditional table was applicable in later periods also with slight variations in the coins of the different regions introduced to suit the relative value of the metals in the localities concerned.

x x x x x

So far there has been no systematic attempt to identify the coins mentioned in epigraphic and literary records of our period. Among literary records the Dvyāśrayakāvya and the Prabandhacintāmaṇi are the most important as referring to many types of coins. The names mentioned in the Dvyāśrayakāvya are bhāgaka, rūpaka, viṃśatika, kārṣāpaṇa, niṣka, sūrpa and dramma,[4]

---

1. Māso viṃśatitamo bhāgaḥ paṇasya parikīrtitaḥ q. by the Mitākṣarā on Yāj., I.365. Also Kṛtyakalpataru, Gārhasthya, pp. 218f.
2. D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.305 states that the ratio varied between 1:60 and 1:80.
3. Kṛtyakalpataru, Gārhasthya, p.219; ibid., Vyavahāra, p.280. See also Grhastharatnākara, p. 447.
4. XVII.79-81, 84, 94; XX.10. See also A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 271.

whereas the Prabandhacintāmaṇi refers to dīnāra, niṣka, dramma, viṃśopaka and ṭaṅka.[1] In the Bṛhatkathākoṣa of Hariṣeṇa we have references to kapardaka or akṣa, dramma and dīnāra.[2] These same names are found in other literary works also but those which are most frequently mentioned are rūpaka, dīnāra, niṣka and kārṣāpaṇa.

The coin names occurring in the Paramāra inscriptions are rūpaka, ardharūpaka, dramma and viṃśopika.[3] The Caulukya records mention dramma, viṃśopaka, rūpaka and kārṣāpaṇa, the Vīsalapriya-dramma and the Bhīmapriyadramma.[4] In the Pratihāra inscriptions we find the names of dramma, pāda, rūpaka, viṃśopaka, paṇa and kākiṇī.[5] According to D.Sharma the chief coins circulating in the area under the Cāhamānas were dramma, viṃśopaka, lohaḍiyā, rūpaka, raupya-ṭaṅka, jītal and dīnāra.[6] In the Siyadoni inscription[7] alone we find pañcīyaka-dramma, Vigrahapāla-dramma, Vigraha-tunigīyadramma, Śrīmadādivarāha-dramma, viṃśopakas, kākiṇī, varāṭaka and kapardaka.

It is clear from the numerous references to dramma in the inscriptions of the early medieval period[8] that it was the

---

1. A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 271.
2. J.U.P.H.S., XIX.85.
3. D.C.Ganguly, Paramāra Dynasty, p. 243.
4. A .K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.271.
5. B.N.Puri, Pratihāras, pp. 134-36.
6. Early Chauhān Dynasties, pp. 302ff.
7. See E.I., I pp. 168f.
8. J.N.S.I., XVII.66-68; D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p. 303; B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p. 216.

most common coin. The name is variously spelt, and is sometimes abbreviated as drā or dra.[1] The term dramma is derived from the Greek drachma. These coins were called dramma because they adopted the weight standard for a drachma. We know that the weight of a drachma is followed by coins which are generally described as the Indo-Sassanian or gadahiyā coins. The term dramma would appear to have originally and mostly denoted this series of coins and later on came to be applied for other coins which adopted the drachma weight standard. A general support for this is to be found in the close resemblance in the geographical distribution of the Indo-Sassanian coins and the areas covered by the inscriptions referring to drammas. These include Rajasthan, Marwar, Gujarat, the northern parts of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire, Central India and U.P.[2] The term dramma though originally connected with a weight scheme does not seem to have been used in the epigraphic records for coins of different metals; on the contrary it appears to have mostly been used for silver coins with this weight.[3] In one inscription dramma is distinguished from suvarṇa[4] which obviously denoted a gold coin, while

---

1. J.N.S.I., XVII.68f.
2. The coins with the name Śrī Vigraha are found in east up to Magadha. It is however significant that dramma is mentioned also in the Bodhgaya inscription of Dharmapala - J.A.S.B. (N.S.), IV.101.
3. Bhagwanlal Indraji-J.B.B.R.A.S., XII.325-8; D.R.Bhandarkar-A.I.N., pp.207, 209; V.V.Mirashi-J.N.S.I., III.36f; C.I.I., IV p. clxxxiv.
4. E.I., VII.40.

in some others it is differentiated from paṇa[1], most likely a copper coin. The Līlāvatī of Bhāskarācārya[2] gives the following equations : 16 paṇas=1 dramma, 16 drammas=1 niṣka. It would appear from this table that paṇa, dramma and niṣka signified respectively copper, silver and gold coins. There are also other indications to suggest that dramma denoted basically a silver currency. Thus the Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya of Kṣemakīrti describes the drammas of Bhillamāla as being of silver.[3] An inscription from Dhoda (Mewar) dated 1171 A.D. specifically refers to the drammas with the name of Ajayadeva as being of silver.[4] In the Upakeśagacchapaṭṭāvali the gadahiyā-mudrā which stands for the Indo-Sassanian coins or the drammas of the inscriptions is said to have been made of silver.[5]

We know that, following the example of Gāṅgeyadeva, many dynasties struck their gold coins after the weight standard of a drachma. No doubt, so far as the weight of these coins is concerned it will be convenient to describe their several denominations in terms of drammas. But it does not appear likely that dramma occurring in the records of northern India

---

1. E.I., XXIV.329ff.
2. I.2-4.
3. Rūpamayam vā nāṇakam bhavati yathā Bhillamāle drammaḥ q. in J.N.S.I., XIV.109.
4. Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrikā, XLV.358.
5. J.N.S.I., XX.18.

in the early medieval period denoted gold coins. The only exception to this is found in an inscription of the ninth century which refers to kāñcanadramma-śatam.[1] As the gold coins with the seated goddess device and adopting the drachma weight standard are known to have been initiated by Gāṅgeyadeva, the present reference could not have been to coins of this series. Either dramma is to be taken here as a general term for a coin or else we have to postulate that the Indo-Sassanian coins were struck of gold also.[2] It has been suggested by A.K.Majumdar[3] that, as in the northern provinces of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire,[4] dramma in the Caulukya records also was applied to both silver and gold coins. To prove th at dramma sometimes denoted a gold coin he relies on the Timana grant which mentions the grants of a rūpaka and a dramma made to a temple.[5] He argues that as here there is a reference to a daily grant of one rūpaka and an annual grant of one dramma, dramma denoted a coin of greater value most probably a gold coin. But the inscription refers to two different grants and there is nothing to suggest that

---

1. I.A., XIII.136.
2. Mr. Nagar of the Lucknow Museum claims to have found a gold coin of Bhoja (B.N.Puri, Pratihāras, p.153 f.n.) who is known to have struck the Indo-Sassanian coins of the Ādi-varāha type of silver and copper.
3. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp.273f. See also J.N.S.I., XVII.77f.
4. A.S.Altekar, Rāshṭrakūṭas and their times, pp.364f.
5. I.A., XI.337. The reference is probably to Plate II ll.1-3.

they stand for the same grant in terms of a daily and annual award.[1] It has been suggested in a recent study[2] that there were gold drammas known after the name of king Vīsaladeva. This is evidently based on the Bhinmal inscription of V.S. 1345[3] which mentions raukma Vīsalaprī dra 200. This is the solitary instance of its kind aginst which a case of general improbability is created by the fact that hitherto no such gold coins have been discovered. We would suggest that here raukma is a mistake for raukya meaning cash which is also used in the Lekhapaddhati[4] in connection with money transactions in terms of the coins in circulation.

Our records mention certain types of drammas[5] named after the king who issued them. The Śrīmad-Ādivarāha dramma mentioned in the Siyadoni inscription[6] and the Varāhamudrā of the Dravya-parīkṣā[7] is to be identified with the Indo-Sassanian coins with the legend Śrīmadādivarāha, issued by the Pratihāra king Bhoja I.[8] The drammas variously described in the Siyadoni inscription as

---

1. J.N.S.I., XIX.118f.
2. J.N.S.I., XVII.78.
3. Bombay Gazetteer, I pt. 1 p.488.
4. pp. 25, 34, 35, 36, 41, 56.
5. I have taken much help from the article on the subject by Mr. R.C.Agrawal - J.N.S.I., XVII.69-76.
6. E.I., I.169.
7. J.N.S.I., X.29.
8. See the Kaman inscription (E.I., XXIV.332) for a reference to drammas circulated by king Bhojadeva.

Vigrahapālīya dramma, Vigrahapāladramma, Vigrahapāla-satka dramma and Vigraha dramma can easily be recognised as the Indo-Sassanian coins with the name of Śrī Vigraha on them, though it is difficult to be dogmatic about the king who struck them. The Siyadoni inscription also refers to the Vigrahatuṅgīya drammas which are generally identified with the Vigrahapālīya drammas.[1] S.Ray[2] proposes to identify these with the Kashmir coins of Vigrahatuṅga. But the coins from Kashmir are not known to have been based on the drachma standard of weight and hence the name dramma can be applied to them only if dramma is treated as a general term for coins. Some coins of the typical Kashmir device of debased standing king and goddess have on them the name of Śrī Vigraha but are not known to have circulated outside Kashmir.

The Purātana-Prabandha-Saṅgraha[3] variously spells a coin as Bhīmapriya-dramma, Bhīmaprī drāma, Bhīmapuri drāma and Bhīmasena dramma. These may be identified with Bhīmapuri coins mentioned in the Dravya-parīkṣā[4] and were probably struck by one of the Caulukya kings with the name of Bhīma. But we have yet

---

1. J.N.S.I., III.38; XIV.125 f.n.3.
2. J.N.S.I., XIV.125-7.
3. pp. 33, 34, 65, 95; J.N.S.I., XVII.71.
4. Bhīmapriya-daśa-viṃśopaka mentioned in the Juna (Marwar) Inscription of V.S. 1352 (E.I., XI.59) also implies the existence of Bhīmapriya drammas.

to find a coin with this name.

In the epigraphic records there are references to Vīsala-prī dra, Vīsalapriya-dramma, Vīsa dra and Vīsalapurī dra.[1] The Lekhapaddhati calls these both Viśvamallapriya and Vīsalapriya dramma.[2] These coins have most likely to be ascribed to king Vīsaladeva of the Vāghela dynasty. But no such coins have yet been ~~its~~ recovered.

The Ajayadeva drammas mentioned in an inscription from Dhoda (Mewar) dated 1171 A.D.[3] have been described as Ajayapriya rūpakas in the Pṛthvīrāja-vijaya Mahākāvya.[4] These coins were struck by the Cāhamāna king Ajayadeva and have been recovered from Rajasthan.

The records of the early medieval period reveal the names of several other coins with the name of dramma attached to them. Poruthi dra and pāruttha dra are mentioned in an inscription of Aparāditya II dated 1184 A.D.[5] An inscription of Śilāhāra king Someśvara dated 1260 A.D. refers to poruttha dramas[6] (sic). In the Purātana-Prabandha-saṅgraha these coins are called pārūthaka[7] or pārutha.[8] The Kharataragaccha-brhadgurvāvali

---

1. J.N.S.I., XVII.72f.
2. For Viśvamallapriya drammas see pp. 33, 37, 39, 55; for Vīsalapriya drammas see p. 42.
3. Nāgarī Pracārinī Patrikā, XLV.538.
4. V.88-89.
5. J.B.O.R.S., XXIX.211-15 ll. 10-11.
6. E.I., XXIII.280 ll. 13-15.
7. pp. 53, 128.
8. p. 78.

mentions these as pāruttha drammas.[1] The Lekhapaddhati gives the name as pāraupatha[2] or pārupathaka.[3] It is not possible to explain the name of this coin or to identify it. The references suggest that it was circulating in Rajasthan, Malwa, Gujarat and Konkan and Marwar areas. A.K.Nairne[4] suggested these to be Parthian drammas mentioned as Khurāsāni dirhams by Abul Fida and as Tātariya or Tahiriyeh dirhams by Al-Mas'ūdī and Sulaimān. But the pāruttha drammas appear to have been in regular and common circulation in Marwar and Konkan and so it would not be safe to identify them with any foreign currency.[5] In all the references to this coin ~~it~~ in the Lekhapaddhati they are said to have been struck at the mint of Śrīmāla.[6] C.D.Dalal takes paraupatha to represent a proper name. The Lekhapaddhati uses the adjectives śreṣṭha and śrīmat before pāraupatha. But these do not necessarily imply that pāraupatha was a personal name. The adjective śreṣṭha is for the coin and refers to its good condition, while śrīmat, if not used for the coin, does not by itself make pāraupatha the name of a king because the Lekhapaddhati is literally full of cases of the use of śrīmat before the name of a city. It is not unlikely that the name of the

---

1. pp. 2, 13.
2. pp. 34, 41f, 35, 36f.
3. p. 43.
4. B.G., 1896 I pt II p. 21 f.n.6.
5. J.N.S.I., XVII.75.
6. Lekhapaddhati, p.114.

coin was derived from the place of its origin or minting, which seems to receive support from the forms pārupathaka and pārū-thaka.[1] V.S.Agrawala[2] seems to have been right when he identified the pāraupatha drammas with the Bhillamāla drammas or the Śrīmālīya drammas. The name Śrīmālīya dramma would appear to be supported by the Lekhapaddhati which always refers to the pārūthaka coins as minted at the Śrīmālīya mint. In the Purātana-Prabandha-saṅgraha[3] it is the pārūthaka drammas which alone are said to have circulated in the kingdom of Jalore near Bhinmal. Śrīmāla and Bhillamāle evidently refer to the same city. Kṣemakīrti in his commentary on the Bṛhatkalpa Bhāṣya refers to the drammas of Bhillamāl.[4] But we would emphasise that there were no coins with the names of Bhillamāla or Śrīmālīya drammas.[5] The excavations at Bhinmal in 1954 did not yield any such coin.[6] Śrīmāla or Bhillamāla was the name of a mint city and there is no justification for supposing that only one solitary type of coin was struck at this mint. In the Lekhapaddhati we have references to the minting at Śrīmāla of

---

1. In the Bilhari Stone Inscription (C.I.I., IV pp. 209ff, v.81) paura appears to have been the name of a coin used in connection with a tax on the sale of elephants and horses in the local market. See also vv.79 and 80 of the same inscription.
2. J.N.S.I., XII.201.
3. p. 53.
4. J.N.S.I., XIV.109.
5. Contra see J.N.S.I., XVII.74.
6. Ibid.

not only the paraupatha dramma but also the Viśvamallapriya drammas[1] and drammas in general.[2]

The Purātan-Prabandha-Saṅgraha[3] equates 8 drammas with one pārutthaka. But even this clue does not help us in identifying the pārutthaka coin. The higher value attached to the pāruttha-ka coins could have been due to either their higher weight or superiority in metal. But as we do not know of any coin weighing 540 grains the first possibility is ruled out. It is not unlikely that in contrast to the highly debased or billon pieces the pārutthaka coins were of very pure silver or were silver coins plated with gold.[4]

The Jaunpur brick inscription of V.S. 1273[5] mentions a mortgage in terms of ṣaḍboddika drammas. V.S.Agrawala suggests that it was a copper coin equal in value to six boddikas or 3/32 silver kārṣāpaṇa[6]. This can be accepted only when we take dramma as a general name for coins. If ka dramma here signifies the Indo-Sassanian coins of silver weighing 67.5 grains then

---

1. pp. 33, 37, 39, 42, 55.
2. p. 34.
3. p. 53.
4. D.Sharma, J.N.S.I., XXII.196 regards the pāruttha drammas as a silver coin on the basis of the Lekhapaddhati, pp. 34, 43. But we do not find any indication of it in any of the references to this coin in this text. Probably D.Sharma bases his view on the term raukya used in some cases. But raukya means cash and refers to the cash payment of these coins in the transactions recorded in the documents.
5. J.U.P.H.S., XVIII.196.
6. Ibid.; J.N.S.I., XII.202.

ṣaḍboddika dramma implies an inherent contradiction as a dramma cannot be equal to six boddikas in value. We learn from the Līlāvatī[1] that a dramma is equal to 64 kākiṇīs, which is another term for a boddika. Cunningham[2] connected boddika with pādika or one-fourth of the ancient kārṣa being 11.2 ($44.8/4$) grains in weight and hence a ṣaḍboddika dramma is made equal to 67.2 grains (11.2x6) and thus is said to represent the gadhaiyā coins of the period.[3] Cunningham's interpretation of boddika is however doubtful. Boddika is to be connected with boḍḍi, boḍiā or hoḍī which was used for a kākiṇī and was equal to 80 cowries. We would interpret ṣaḍboddika-dramma on the analogy of kapardaka-voḍḍi[4] and kapardaka-purāṇa[5] as a dramma calculated in terms of 6 boḍis.[6] In the Līlāvatī[7] we find the equations 4 kākiṇīs (i.e., boḍis)=1 paṇa; 16 paṇas=1 dramma. It would therefore appear that ordinarily a dramma was calculated in terms of a paṇa of 4 boḍis. In opposition to the common drammas which were caturboddikas and equal to 64 boḍis, the ṣaḍboddikas were higher in value being equal to 96 boḍis.

---

1. I.2-4.
2. Archaeological Survey Reports, XI.176; C.M.I., p.50.
3. J.A.S.B. (Num.Supp.), 1930, p.34; Rapson, Indian Coins, p. 34; B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p.217.
4. E.I., XXIII.140 l.6.
5. In many Sena grants e.g., I.B., III.99ff.
6. J.N.S.I., XX.39.
7. I.2-4.

A comparison of the tables in the Līlāvatī[1] and Śrīdhara's Gujarati commentary on the Gaṇitasāra[2] indicated that there were two types of drammas with two different values. The dramma in the Līlāvatī is worth 1280 (16x4x20) cowries, whereas according to the commentary on the Gaṇitasāra it was equal to 2000 (5x4x 5x20) cowries thus being worth 1½ times the former. Significantly enough this is the relation between an ordinary or caturboddika dramma and a ṣaḍboddika dramma and it is therefore not unlikely that the drammas contemplated in the Gujarati commentary was a ṣaḍboddika dramma. We have seen that some of the available Indo-Sassanian coins show a very wide difference in weight between 50 and 70 grains. It is not unlikely that the heavier pieces represented the ṣaḍboddikas.

The Siyadoni inscription[3] mentions pañcīyaka drammas. It has been suggested on the analogy of the ṣaḍboddika dramma, that it consisted of five boddikas and connecting boddika with pādika weighing 11.2 grains, the pañcīyaka drammas are said to weigh 56 (11.2x5) grains.[4] This weight scheme was adopted by the Ṣāhi kings and by others who struck coins after those of the Ṣāhis, and thus it is further claimed that pañcīyaka drammas

---

1. Ibid.
2. J.N.S.I., XX.40.
3. E.I., I.169, ll. 6, 37.
4. J.A.S.B (num.Supp.), 1930, pp. 34ff.

are to be regarded as one of the two principal types of coins on the basis of their weights. But as we have pointed out boddika is to be connected not with pādika but with voḍi or kākiṇī. Moreover the term pañcīyaka is not the same in form as the ṣaḍboddika, since it makes no mention of the boḍi. B.N. Puri[1] has put forward the ingeneous suggestion that these coins were introduced by the local goṣṭhi or pañcāyat. But the term for such corporate bodies in the records of the period is pañcakula and not pañca. Then, as rightly shown by A.K.Majumdar[2] the pañcakula did not represent the modern pañcāyat but rather denotes a body of five men to assist various ministers and officers. Even if it is conceded that such local bodies existed in the period, there is no independent evidence to show that they possessed the important right to mint coins in their name. V.V.Mirashi[3] has pointed out that in the Siyadoni inscription[4] a cess of ¼ Ādivarāha drammas is subsequently put down as paṃ dra 1. It therefore follows that ꝛx a quarter dramma was known as a pañcīyaka dramma, most probably because it was equal in value to 5 viṃśopakas. We have seen elsewhere[5] that there are many coins which weigh about the one-fourth of

---

1. Pratihāras, p.134.
2. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, pp. 236-42.
3. C.I.I., IV p. cxxxiv.
4. E.I., I.175-77, l.37.
5. See supra pp. 281-93.

the standard weight of a drachma. These may very well have been pañcīyaka drammas. Thus in this case the term dramma would appear to have been used rather loosely and did not denote a coin weighing 67.5 grains. The pañcīyaka drammas no doubt were connected with the dramma coins being a sub-division of the drammas and so were justified in retaining the name of dramma. It is however to be noted that the Siyadoni inscription itself there is a reference to a quarter of a pañcīyaka dramma (pañcīyaka-dramma-pāda)[1]. If this refers not to the abstract value but to some specific coin having that value, then this would represent 1/16 of the drachma weight standard. This would be a really tiny coin, especially in view of the usual depreciation in the coins of this period, and we have yet to recover a coin with such a weight. In this case it is not unlikely that pañcīyaka dramma did not represent a coin weighing one-fourth of a dramma but a coin having that value, and it probably contained considerable copper.[2]

In the Kharataragaccha-brhadgurvavali and the Lekhapaddhati we find references to dvivallaka drammas.[3] C.D.Dalal[4] and V.S.

---

1. E.I., I.173, l.6.
2. Drā Kla coins of the inscriptions (E.I., XI.51-2; Jain Inscriptions I p.229 no.884) may refer in abbreviations to some kind of drammas - J.N.S.I., XVII.75f. But it is not possible to explain their nature.
3. J.N.S.I., XXII.197f.
4. Lekhapaddhati, p. 118.

Agrawala[1] explain these as coins having a mixture of two vālas or six rattīs of base metal. Recently D.Sharma[2] has pointed out that the dvivallaka dramma may be a Muslim coin introduced into Rajasthan and Gujarat after these territories were conquered by the Khaljīs, there being no reference to the actual use of this coin before 1323 A.D. He explains these coins as having two parts of base metal for one of precious, i.e., having silver and copper in the ratio of 1:2. He shows that the aṭhagānī coins of the dramma class belonging to the reign of Qutbuddīn Mubārak as described by Ṭhakkura Pheru have twice as much copper as silver. This seems convincing. But if vallaka is taken as a weight then the dvivallaka drammas may be explained alternatively as a sub-denomination of a dramma weighing 2 vālas or 6 rattīs or 10.98 grains. It is not unlikely that some smaller coins approximating to this weight represented the dvivallaka drammas.

There are many epigraphic references to half (drammārdhika or drammārdha), three-fourths quarters (dramma-tribhāga) and a quarter (pāda) drammas.[3] We have elsewhere[4] seen that there are coins which are equal to the above-mentioned fractions of the weight of a dramma. Though there is no reference to one-

---

1. J.N.S.I., XII.202f.
2. J.N.S.I., XXII.197-200.
3. J.N.S.I., XVII.79f.
4. See supra pp. 281-93.

eighth of a dramma, such coins have actually been recovered.[1] In an inscription from Ahar (Udaipur) of V.S. 1010 there is a reference to a cess as being 1/40th part of a dramma (drammārdha-viṃśaka).[2] No coin of such a weight is known and unless it is taken to refer to a copper coin, it most likely stands for an arithmetical value and not for any specific coinx.

The coin called viṃśopaka is sometimes spelt as vaṃsopaka, visovaka, visopaka, piṃsopaka, viśopaka, visopaga and visovaga.[3] It is clear from the Bhinmal inscription dated 1182 A.D.[4] that this was a coin considerably lesser in value than a dramma. This inscription refers to a tax of one vi on every dramma. D.R.Bhandarkar[5] regarded viṃśopaka as a copper coin equal in value to 1/20th of a dramma. This suggestion is supported by the Siyadoni inscription[6] which mentions a monthly tax of half a Vigrahaturigīya dramma and then abbreviates this as s vi 10 i.e., 10 viṃśopakas. The Gaṇitasāra of Ṭhakkura Pheru also equates 20 viṃśopakas with one dramma.[7] As suggested by V.V.

---

1. J.N.S.I., XVII.82.
2. I.A., LVIII.162.
3. J.N.S.I., XVII.80.
4. B.G., I pt. I pp.47f-teṣāṃ prati dra vi 1 labhya.
5. E.I., X p. 19 f.n.3. Originally he identified viṃśopaka with paṇa or māṣa which according to Kātyāyana's table represents 1/20th of a silver kārṣāpaṇa which in turn Bhandarkar identified with dramma.
6. E.I., I.173ff, l.20.
7. D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.319.

Mirashi[1] the coin was so named because it formed the twentieth part of a dramma. Bhandarkar seems to be justified in regarding viṃśopaka as a copper coin, because a silver coin weighing 1/20th of a dramma has not yet been recovered and would have been so tiny as to be inconvenient to handle. There are a few epigraphic references where viṃśopakas are not converted into their equivalent drammas.[2] But this does not affect the relation between the two coins, because such a way of representing the figures might have been regarded as more convenient as is sometimes the practise in modern times.

In the epigraphic records we find references to viṃśopakas associated with Vigrahadrammas, Varāha-drammas and those named Bhīmapriya.[3] The Vṛṣa-viṃśopakas referred to in the Arthuna inscription dated 1079 A.D.[4] may have been either those with the

---

1. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxix f.n.7. B.N.Puri, Pratihāras, p.135 identifies viṃśopaka with ancient viṃśatika mentioned by Patañjali. He probably bases his suggestion on the similarity between the two names. Sandesara (J.N.S.I., VIII.143) regards viṃśopaka as identical with bīsā mentioned in the Gujarati commentary on the Gapitasāra. But as pointed out by D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.304 viṃśopaka is to be equated with lohaṭika and not bīsā of the table. According to the table a dramma is equal to 100 bīsās or 20 lohaṭikas. Hara Govindadas Trikamchand explains visopaga or visovaga as the 1/20th part of a cowrie-shell-Pāia Sadda Mahannavo, IV p.1007.
2. J.N.S.I., XVII.81; D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, p.303 f.n.45. The Dandhapur (Sirohi) Inscription of V.S.1233 records a gift of 36 viṃśopakas and not 1 dramma and 16 viṃśopakas. In the Gundoch inscription of V.S.1288 the rate of interest is given as 1/20 dramma.
3. J.N.S.I., XVII.81.
4. E.I., XIV.295ff.

bull and horseman device or else those of the bull and Śiva type.

In the Bilhari inscription there is a reference to a coin called ṣoḍaśikā which V.V.Mirashi[2] regards on the analogy of the viṃśopaka as a copper coin worth 1/16 of a dramma. The Līlāvatī[3] makes one dramma equal to 16 paṇas. It is therefore not unlikely that ṣoḍaśikā was another name for the copper coin commonly known as paṇa. But we learn from the Śārṅgadhara-saṃhitā that the coin was called ṣoḍaśikā because it weighed 16 māṣas.[4]

Rūpaka is another term which is very often referred to in the literary and epigraphic records of the period.[5] The references to suvarṇa rūpakas in the Rājataraṅgiṇī and Kathāsarit-sāgara[6] indicate that in literary works rūpakas sometimes denoted coins in general. But rūpya rūpaka basically and generally stands for a silver coin.[7] In the Pṛthvīrājavijaya[8] the drammas struck by king Ajayadeva are called rūpaka. But rūpaka often referred to a specific silver coin and hence was distinguished from the dramma. The Ahar inscription belonging to the reign of the Guhila king Allaṭa records the tax of one dramma on the

---

1. C.I.I., IV pp. 209ff, v.79.
2. Ibid., p. clxxxix.
3. I.2.
4. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxix.
5. J.N.S.I., XIX.116ff.
6. Ibid., 119.
7. Ibid., 117.
8. V.88-89.

sale of an elephant and two rūpakas on that of a horse.[1] It is clear from this that rūpaka was different from and lower in value than dramma. B.N.Puri[2] suggests that its value was between ½ and 1/20 of a dramma. According to the Gujarati commentary on the Gaṇitasāra one dramma was equal to five rūpakas.[3] It is not unlikely that some of the silver coins of our period which weigh about 13.5 grains were meant to be used as rūpakas. Viṣṇugupta as quoted in Hemādri's Vratakhaṇḍa equates 70 rūpakas with a suvarṇa and 28 rūpakas with a dīnāra[4]. We learn from the commentary on the Uttarādhyayana Sūtra that one rūvaga (=rūpaka) was equal to 8 kākiṇīs.[5]

The Anjaneri plates of Bhogaśakti dated 710-11 A.D.[6] refer to the rūpakas of Kṛṣṇarāja. These are to be identified with the silver coins weighing between 30 and 34 grains and struck by king Kṛṣṇarāja (c. 555-575 A.D.) of the Kalacuri family.[7]

The Dvyāśrayakāvya mentions a coin called bhāgaka which has been explained by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi as a term representing the half of a rūpaka. It may be concluded from this that Abhayatilaka Gaṇi treated bhāgaka as standing for a theoretical

---

1. I.A., LVIII.162.
2. Pratihāras, p. 136.
3. J.N.S.I., VIII.144.
4. J.N.S.I., XIX.116.
5. J.U.P.H.S., XVIII.67 f.n.104.
6. C.I.I., IV pp. 149ff, ll.38, 39.
7. J.B.B.R.A.S., XXI pp. 213f.
8. XVII.24, p.389 - bhāgaśabdo rūpakārdhe.

coin-value and not some specific coin. In another place also he refers to rūpakārdha.[1] It is however not unlikely that there were actually coins weighing 6.75 grains or 1/10 of a dramma. A coin of Gāṅgeyadeva weighs 5.6 grains[2] and may have been struck as a bhāgaka. On the basis of a reference in the Dvyāśrayakāvya as explained by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi[3] viṃśatika is taken to be a coin worth 20 rūpakas.[4] As there is no silver coin weighing 270 grains (13.5x20), it has been suggested that viṃśatika was a gold coin.[5] But we would argue that viṃśatika was not the name of any specific coin, but merely represented twenty times the value of a given coin. It was not connected with any specific coin but could be used for all alike. The commentary by Abhayatilaka Gaṇi clearly implies this when it explains viṃśatika as being twenty times the value of the rūpaka and other coins.

Another coin name in the Dvyāśrayakāvya[6] which is not referred to in any other source is sūrpa. It appears to have been a coin of very little value, but it is not possible to say anything definite about it or to identify it.

---

1. Ibid., XVII.93 - rūpakārdha-drammapañcakādi.
2. C.C.I.M., I p.251 no.9.
3. XVII.81 p.382 - viṃśatī rūpakādīni mānam-asya viṃśatikam.
4. J.N.S.I., XIX.119; A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.271.
5. J.N.S.I., VIII.145.
6. XVII.84.

In the literary records and also some of the inscriptions we find references to kārṣāpaṇas.[1] Kārṣāpaṇa is explained as a silver coin weighing a karṣa or 80 raktikās[2] or 146.4 grains. But it is to be noted that no known silver coin of the early medieval period is based on this weight standard. Hence the references to kārṣāpaṇas in this period are to be explained as survivals from earlier times or else as referring to weights of silver. It is also possible that in this period when coins were usually struck of a lesser weight than those of earlier times, the silver coins adopting the drachma weight standard were commonly referred to as kārṣāpaṇas.[3] This would receive support from the fact that the Līlāvatī equates 16 paṇas with one dramma, since we know that this was the original relation between paṇas and kārṣāpaṇas. Another possibility is that kārṣāpaṇa was used to denote silver coins which in this period were struck according to the weight standard of a purāṇa. In some sources like the Gujarati commentary on the Gaṇitasāra[4] one purāṇa, like the ancient kārṣāpaṇa, is described as equal to 16 paṇas.

In the Kaman Stone inscriptions of Bhojadeva we have a

---

1. Dvyāśraya XVII.79, 84.
2. J.N.S.I., XIX.117.
3. D.R.Bhandarkar, A.I.N., p. 210 had originally suggested it but subsequently he changed his opinion-E.I., X p.19 f.n.3.
4. J.N.S.I., VIII.141ff.

reference to paṇas along with drammas.[1] Paṇa is used for a copper coin as opposed to rūpya or rūpaka for a silver coin.[2] We have seen above that 16 paṇas are equated alike with purāṇa, dramma and kārṣāpaṇa. The paṇa coins weigh a karṣa or 146.4 grains.[3] We find thatx some copper coins of the early medieval period are based on the karṣa standard of weight and are to be treated as paṇas. On the basis of the equation 80 cowries = 1 purāṇa as given in lexicons and of 16 paṇas = 1 purāṇa in the Gaṇitasāra A.K.Majumdar[4] deduces that one paṇa is worth 5 cowries. This may be regarded as one of the traditions about the value of a paṇa. But he does not take notice of the fact that in most of the tables on coins we have the equations 20 varāṭakas or kauḍas = 1 kākiṇī or boḍī and 4 kākiṇīs = 1 paṇa.[5] Thus the usual and common value of a paṇa was 80 cowries.

In the literary works of our period we generally find gold coins referred to as niṣka, suvarṇa and dīnāra. Of these dīnāra in many cases came to stand for coins in general. Thus Jonarāja in his commentary on the Pṛthvīraja-vijaya Mahākāvya[6] explains the silver coins of Ajayadeva called rūpaka as a

---

1. E.I., XXIV.329ff.
2. J.N.S.I., XIX.117.
3. E.g., Vaijayantī, p. 189 l.79.
4. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.272.
5. Līlāvatī, I.2-4; Gujarati commentary on the Gaṇitasāra - J.N.S.I., VIII.141ff; Bengali arithmetical table - J.U.P.H.S., XVIII.196.
6. V.88-89; J.N.S.I., XIX.117f.

special kind of dīnāra (or coin). In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[1] we have a reference to dinnāras of gold, silver and copper. Stein[2] observes that if the dinnāra was more than a mere abstract unit of account, it could not well have been represented by any other token than the cowrie. The term dinnāra is derived, through the Greek, from the Latin denarius, which was a silver coin, but in Sanskrit lexicons it is treated as a name for a gold coin. It is not unlikely that the term sometimes denoted a gold coin struck in the Gupta period. According to Viṣṇugupta, as quoted in Hemādri's Vratakhaṇḍa 70 rūpakas = 1 suvarṇa and 28 rūpakas = 1 dīnāra.[3] Thus the relation between the values of a dīnāra and a suvarṇa will be 2:5. But Nārada and Kātyāyana treat suvarṇa and dīnāra as being synonymous.[4] According to the Līlāvatī 16 drammas are equal in value to a niṣka, whereas a karṣa (146.4 grains) of gold is called suvarṇa.[5] Excepting a few stray pieces the gold coins of this period are not found adopting the weight standard for a suvarṇa. It is likely that some of the gold coins of our period which appear to have been based on the drachma standard of weight were some-

---

1. VII.950.
2. Rāj., Vol. II p. 323.
3. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III p.122 f.n.162.
4. Ibid.
5. I.2-4.

times called niṣkas. From the Dvyāśrayakāvya[1] we learn that niṣka was a gold piece weighing 108 palas. As one pala is equal to 4 karṣas the weight of a niṣka becomes too great to form a convenient coin and hence the niṣka of the present reference is to be regarded as rather as a metallic weight.

In the Kharataragaccha-bṛhadgurvāvali there are references to hema-ṭaṅka and raupya-ṭaṅka which D.Sharma regards as Muslim coins introduced by the Khaljīs after the conquest of Rajasthan and Gujarat.[2] Gold ṭaṅkas are mentioned by Jīnamaṇḍana and also in the Prabandhacintāmaṇi.[3] Ṭaṅka originally seems to have been a simple weight being equal to 4 māṣas or 8 rattīs or 14.64 grains.[4] But as the derivation of the term suggests it was also used as a general name of a coin. That ṭaṅka was a very common name of a coin, whether general or of a specific type or metal, would follow from the coins of Mahmūdpur (new Lahore) struck by Mahmūd of Ghazni which have the name dirham in the cufic legend and ṭaka (or ṭaṅka) in the Brāhmī legend.[5] Ṭhakkura Pheru in his Gaṇitasāra equates 50 drammas with one ṭaṅka.[6] It is clear that the coin denoted by taṅka here was a gold coin.

---

1. XVII.84.
2. J.N.S.I., XXII.197.
3. p.15; A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.271.
4. J.N.S.I., XXII.200.
5. Thomas, Chronicles of the Pathan kings of Delhi, illustration 7; J.A.S.B.(Num.Supp.), 1930, p.40.
6. D.Sharma, Early Chauhan Dynasties, p.319.

In the Rewa Stone Inscription of Vijayasiṃha[1] there is a reference to ṭaṅkakas stamped with the effigy of Bhagavat (Bhagavanmudrayā). V.V.Mirashi[2] explains this as referring to the gold coins of Gāṅgeyadeva bearing the figure of Bhagavatī or Lakṣmī. He thus argues that gold coins of the period were called ṭaṅkas. This is also indicated by some of the references given above. But as this name is not found in any other inscription it may be suggested that some of the existing names for gold coins like niṣka, suvarṇa and dīnāra which technically were applicable to gold coins of specific weight were also used to refer loosely to the gold coins of the period.

Another term which in the early medieval period denoted a gold coin was gadyāṇaka. In northern India it is found only in the records of the Gāhaḍavālas.[3] V.V.Mirashi equates ṭaṅkas and gadyāṇakas and adds that the larger gold coins of the Gāhaḍavālas weighing between 59 and 68 grains may be taken to be gadyāṇakas.[4] The weight of a gadyāṇaka according to the Līlāvatī[5] is 48 rattīs or 87.84 grains. It would therefore appear that even the larger coins of the Gāhaḍavālas were not based on the gadyāṇaka standard but were the result of the desire on the

---

1. C.I.I., IV no. 67 ll.20-21.
2. Ibid., p. clxxxiii.
3. See B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p.242 n.74.
4. C.I.I., IV p. cxxxiii.
5. I.3.

part of their issuer to be faithful to the standard weight of a dramma. Thus these Gahadavala coins are to be named as gadyāṇaka only when the term is taken to refer to a gold coin in a very loose manner.

x x x x x x

It appears that for daily transactions cowries had come to be very largely used in our period. Fa-hsien[1] observes that even in his period Indians were using cowries in buying and selling commodities. The records for the early medieval period indicate that cowries were in regular use.

The Līlāvatī[2] equates 20 varāṭakas (cowries) with one kākiṇī and four kākiṇīs with one paṇa. The same equations are given in the Gujarati commentary on the Ganitasāra but it uses the name kauḍa for varāṭaka and mentions boḍī as another term for kāgiṇī (or kākiṇī)[3]. We find the same equations in Bengali arithmetical table but as another term gaṇḍā is also introduced the equations are 4 karās(kaurīs) = 1 gaṇḍā; 5 gaṇḍās = 1 burī (boḍiā); 5 burīs = 1 paṇa.[4]

---

1. (Legge) p.43.
2. I.2.
3. J.N.S.I., VIII.141ff.
4. J.U.P.H.S., XVIII.196. V.V.Mirashi (C.I.I., IV p. clxxxix) suggests that kapardā was identical with kākiṇī and was equivalent to 20 cowries. But we think that kapardā itself was a term for cowrie. The kaurī of modern Hindi is derived from kapardā. This is supported by the Gujarati commentary on the Ganitasāra which uses the form kauḍa for cowries-J.N.S.I. VIII.141ff. Kṣemakīrti also in commenting on Bṛhatkalpabhāṣya paraphrases kavaḍḍa as kapardaka-ibid., Vol.II p.573. The

(Continued

The Siyadoni inscription refers to both varāṭaka and kapardaka[1], but as the references are not in the same context it does not affect their being synonyms. In the Bilhari (M.P.) inscription one kapardī is mentioned as a cess to be paid to the Śaiva ascetics by each shop.[2] The Tezpur (Assam) rock inscription of Harjjara lays down a penalty of 100 cowries for the infringement of certain state regulations.[3]

In the copper plate grants of the Sena kings there are references to purāṇas and kapardaka-purāṇas. But these are not two different coin-denominations. From the references in the grants they appear to have been interchangeable terms. Kapardaka was prefixed to purāṇa with a view to make the identity of the coins clear.[4] D.R.Bhandarkar[5] explained the term to refer to a silver coin (purāṇa) shaped like a cowrie (kapardaka). But not a single coin of this shape has been recovered from any part of India; and such a coin besides the difficulty in

---

Continued)
Vaijayantī, p.247 ll.11-12 equates a kākaṇī with 20 cowries (kapardas) and adds that sometimes it is taken to be equal to one kaparda. It would appear that though generally a kākiṇī was regarded as worth 20 cowries in some particular area kākiṇī and kaparda were treated as synonyms.

1. E.I., I pp. 173ff ll.45, 20.
2. C.I.I., IV pp.209ff, v.80. Here kapardī seems to have been differentiated from dyūtakaparda.
3. J.B.O.R.S., 1917, pp.508f.
4. History of Bengal, I pp.668f.
5. A.I.N., pp. 139, 176.

fabrication would mark a retrogression in the evolution of coinage.[1] S.K.Chakravortty[2] convincingly argues that kapardaka-purāṇa was a mere theoretical unit of account representing the value of a purāṇa counted in cowries and not an actual coin. Thus payments would appear to have been made in cowries which represented the prevailing currency and though the silver purāṇas was regarded as the standard xxxx coin it was not in general use and a certain number of cowries came to be equated to the silver coin.

In the Shergadh (Kotah)inscription there is a reference to a coin-denomination called kapardaka-voḍī.[3] A.S.Altekar[4] corrected voḍī into voḍrī, which he regarded as equal to the fourth part of a copper paṇa, and concluded that kapardaka-voḍī must have been equal to 20 cowries. But it would appear from many other references in diverse sources that the name voḍḍi was more common in use.[5] However, his surmise about the value of a voḍī is supported by the Gujarati commentary on the Gaṇitasāra[6] which equates 20 kauḍas with one kāgiṇi or boḍī. What is significant

---

1. I.H.Q., IX.596.
2. Ibid., 599.
3. E.I., XXIII.140 l.6.
4. Ibid.
5. Hemacandra's Prakrit Grammar, UV.335-boḍḍi; Mṛcchakaṭika, VIII.40-voḍia; Gujarati commentary on the Gaṇitasāra-J.N.S.I., VIII.141ff-boḍi; Jaunpur brick inscription-J.U.P.H.S., XVIII. 196-boḍḍika.
6. J.N.S.I., VIII.141ff; also Bengali arithmetical table-J.U.P. H.S., XVIII.196.

in the present inscription is the form kapardaka-voḍī. As it would be absurd to explain the expression as meaning a voḍī equal to a kapardaka it is to be analysed as meaning a voḍī calculated in terms of kapardakas.[1] On the analogy of the kapardaka-purāṇa the present expression is to be taken to indicate that the boḍī was not a coin in actual use but was a theoretical monetary value. The term kapardaka was prefixed to voḍī to make it clear that vodi was really calculated and paid in terms of cowries. This also suggests that round about the Kotah state in Rajasthan cowries were the usual currency.

A.K.Majumdar[2] holds that the mention of cowries does not necessarily mean that the shells were actually in use as a medium of exchange and that for the sake of convenience in calculation the coins of higher denominations were converted into cowries. But the doubt is not well-founded because we have besides the mathematical tables and inscriptions other references to the use of cowries as medium of exchange. The testimony of foreign travellers and writers is also very clear on this point. Chau Ju-kua makes a general statement about the people of T'ién-chu (India) that they use cowries as a

---

1. J.N.S.I., XX.39.
2. Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p. 272.

medium of exchange.[1] We learn from the Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī[2] that when the Muhammadans first came to Bengal they did not find the people using a money currency, but cowries. Ibn Batūta also records that the people of Bengal used cowries as money and purchased them from the inhabitants of the Maldives.[3] All doubts on the subject are set aside by the recent discovery of a treasure trove from Bhaundri village in Lucknow district which contained, besides the coins of the Pratihāra king Vināyakapāla, 9834 cowries.[4]

That the cowries were objects of value and were used for exchange in economic transactions follows from the Uktivyakti-prakaraṇa of Dāmodara Paṇḍita, who was associated with the Gāhaḍavāla court. The text has a reference to a merchant hoarding cowries in his house.[5] Elsewhere it speaks of cowries being counted.[6] The Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara, who also belonged to the Gāhaḍavāla kingdom, mentions kapardakas as typical objects which are counted and are used in economic transactions (gaṇimam).[7] There are literary references also which speak of

---

1. p. 111. Earlier (p.97) he states that the people of P'ön-k'ie-lo (Balhara i.e., the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom) use pieces of white conch shells ground into shape as money.
2. (Tr.) p.556.
3. K.A.N.Sastri, Foreign Notices, p.122.
4. J.U.P.H.S., XIX p. 85.
5. p.51 l.8 - Vaṇijo gṛhe kaparddakān nikṣipyati.
6. p.41 l.7 - Kaparddakān gaṇayati.
7. Vyavahāra, p.124.

cowries as being used in daily transactions; though they are in many cases mentioned as being of very little value, there is no suggestion that they were mere theoretical monetary values.[1] Cowries are known to have been used in India even during the nineteenth century.

x x x x x x x

The question next to be answered is the extent to which the early medieval period had a regular currency. It has to be emphasised at the very outset that even up till a very recent past barter played a considerable part in the economy of India, at least in rural areas. This should serve as a caution for any claim or expectation of a very developed money economy in the early medieval period. In this period also barter[2] can be assumed ϕto have covered most transactions in the villages. It would appear from Medhātithi that merchants and traders also sometimes found it convenient to resort ϕto barter. Medhātithi[3] explains that <u>paṇya</u> (merchandise) is the substance (<u>dravya</u>) that is sold for money, or is exchanged for some other substance. In some of the story books of our period also we read of merchants visiting distant parts of the country and exchanging

---

1. <u>Bṛhatkathākośa</u>, LXXVI.23, 43; XXX.29; <u>Kalāvilāsa</u>, II.5.7; <u>Samayamātṛkā</u>, VIII.80; <u>Narmamālā</u>, I.103; <u>Kuttanīmata</u>, v.633; <u>Dhūrtākhyāna</u>, V.71; <u>Dohākośa</u>, XIV.86 (p.331).
2. <u>Vaijayantī</u>, p.123 l.12; p.128 l.141.
3. On Manu V.127.

their own merchandise/with the wares of those regions.[1] The mathematical texts of the period[2] mention the rule for determining the value in the case of a barter (bhāṇḍa-pratibhāṇḍaka).

The main thing which strikes the student of the numismatics of this period is the extreme paucity of gold coins. The Indo-Sassanian coins are not known to have been struck in gold. The Śāhi kings also struck coins only of silver and copper. The coins of Kashmir reveal a boring uniformity, being only in copper. The solitary exception is that of Harṣa (1089-1101 A.D.) who issued gold and silver coins.[3] Among earlier kings the coins with the name of Pratāpāditya, Vinayāditya, Yaśovarman and Vigraha are often made of an alloy probably intended to pass as base gold.[4] Gold coins in Northern India were first struck, after a gap of many centuries following the Guptas, by Gāṅgeyadeva, the Kalacuri king of Tripuri. His gold coins are not scarce.[5] But it would appear that his successors did not issue coin of any kind.[6] The gold coins of Kīrtivarman, the

---

1. Samarāiccakahā, VI p.16; Triṣaṣṭiśalākā, Vol. I pp.7ff.
2. Līlāvatī, p.35 (no.85); Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha, IV.37-38.
3. C.M.I., p. 34.
4. C.C.I.M., I.266.
5. 22 gold coins from Azamgarh-J.N.S.I., XVII.111; 3 gold coins-Cunningham, A.S.R., X.25; C.I.I., IV p. clxxxiii.
6. Eight gold coins with the name of Gāṅgeyadeva found at Isurpur in Saugor district differ in fabric from the other coins of Gāṅgeyadeva and hence are taken by V.V.Mirashi to have been struck by Karṇa, the son and successor of Gāṅgeyadeva - J.N.S.I., III p.26.

first Candella king to issue coins, are limited in number.[1] For the reign of Madanavarman, whose coins are the most numerous of all Candella kings, we have in all only 59 coins.[2] We have only one coin of base gold for the reign of Paramardi.[3] The gold coins of Hallakṣana are also few, and we have none for Jayavarman and Pṛthvīvarman.[4] There are a few gold coins of Trailokyavarman and two pieces only for Vīravarman.[5] As compared with other dynasties the gold coins of the Kalacuris of Dakṣiṇa Kosala make an impressive list.[6] Among the Paramāra kings we find only a solitary gold coin for king Udayāditya (1060-1087 A.D.).[7] The only Caulukya king whose gold coins have been recovered is Jayasiṃha Siddharāja (1098-1143 A.D.) but these are only two in number.[8] There are two gold coins of Vīrasiṃha of the Kacchapaghāta dynasty of Nalapura,[9] five gold coins with the device of a cow sucking a calf[10] and a unique gold coin of king Devapāla of the Pāla dynasty.[11] Among the kings whom Cunningham

---

1. I.A., XXXVII p. 148.
2. Mitra, Early Rulers of Khajuraho, pp. 183f.
3. J.A.S.B., 1889, p.34.
4. Mitra, Loc. cit., p.183.
5. Ibid., 184.
6. 600 gold coins from Bilaspur-J.A.H.R.S., XII.169; 36 gold coins from Orissa (9 from Puri and 27 from Sonepur)-J.N.S.I., XVII.58ff; 56 coins from Sarangarh in Chhattisgarh-Proc.A.S.B., 1893, p.92.
7. J.A.S.B., N.S., No.XXXIII.203. K.P.Rode reports the discovery of a coin of king Jagadeva of the Paramāra dynasty-J.N.S.I., IX.75. But the details about the coin are lacking.
8. J.A.S.B., N.S., VII.47.
9. I.H.Q., XVIII.71.
10. J.N.S.I., XXII.278-80.
11. J.N.S.I., XIII.123-25.

assigns to the Tomara dynasty only two, Kumārapāladeva and Mahīpāla, are found to have issued gold coins, but even these are scarce. As against the coins of the kings and dynasties noticed above we find that the gold coins of king Govindacandra of the Gāhaḍavāla dynasty are really abundant, though they are extremely debased. Thus in 1887 some 800 of his gold coins were recovered from one single hoard in Bahraich district.[1]

Considering the area and time covered by them these gold coins are miserably meagre in number. If we prepare an exhaustive list of the amount of gold and the number of gold coins which the early Muslim invaders are said to have obtained by way of loot, ransom and penalty much of the paucity of gold coins can be explained. But even this cannot account for the fact that many dynasties and many kings do not appear to have struck any gold coin at all. It is obvious that, in view of the cheapness of commodities in the period when cowries were sufficient for daily transactions, the gold coins would have been very high in value and would not have been ordinarily needed. The feudalisation of the state-structure that took place in the period would have dispensed with much of the need for higher denominations of coins which in earlier periods

---

1. C.C.I.M., I p.257.

might have been required to remunerate or reward important functionaries of the state. It is also not unlikely that coins struck in earlier periods continued to be in circulation in this period. It is significant that after the Guptas no gold coins appear to have been issued for over 450 years. We may suggest that during this period the gold coins of the Kuṣāṇas and Guptas continued to be used but as in course of time many of these were melted down, some of the kings from the eleventh century onward following the example of Gāṅgeyadeva felt the need for issuing gold coins.

Specimens of highly debased gold coins and pieces which were made of silver but had a gold plating indicate that such coins were legal tender in at least the kingdom of the king issuing them. If they were meant to be treated according to their metallic contents there would not have been much sense in debasing them. It would appear therefore that they were intended to represent a value more than that indicated by their metallic contents. But gold coins must have been also used in larger transactions like inter-state trade. It goes without saying that a merchant coming from an area outside the empire of a certain king would not be willing to accept at its intended value a debased gold coin issued by that king. Thus in inter-state and foreign trade relations gold coins were used according to their real weight and purity of metal. The mathematical

texts of our period have a full section dealing with rules relating to calculation of the weight, purity and value of gold and in the illustrations they mention how merchants by combining gold pieces of different purity and exchanging them for other pieces obtain profit.[1] In such circumstances kings usually would not have taken the trouble of minting gold coins but would have left it to the big merchants and trading concerns to issue their own gold coins. The Jāmi 'ul-Hikāyāt of Muhammad 'Aufī records that during the reign of Yamīniud-daula Mahmūd some sharp men of India brought out a dirham of great purity and placed a suitable price upon it. Time passed on and the coin obtained currency. Merchants coming from Muhammadan countries used to purchase these dirhams and carry them to Khurasan. When the people had grown accustomed to the value of the coin, the Indians began by degrees to debase the standard and the merchants unaware of the depreciation, under the impression of deriving a profit brought silver and gold to exchange for the debased coins of copper and brass.[2] Even though the historicity of this particular affair may be doubted, it does reflect the prevailing practice. On this point we have a significant reference in the Rājataraṅgiṇī[3] which says that ⁄

---

1. Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha, V.169-212; Līlāvatī, pp.43-45 (nos.101-9), 30 (no.77).
2. Elliot and Dowson, II.188.
3. VII.211-12.

a good minister under king Ananta (1028-1063 A.D.) abolished the royal privilege of marking the gold according to quality and price, in order to remove the chance of oppression by later kings. We do not have any parallel reference for any other part of northern India. But on the basis of the reference from Kashmir we can say that theoretically a king had the right to examine the gold coins struck by the bankers before they were allowed to circulate. Some of the kings and dynasties must have actually exercised this right. But this was regarded as a source of much trouble to the bankers in case an oppressive king had a mind to exploit it.

Gold coins are amazingly numerous in the Kuṣāṇa and Gupta periods. This gold currency was issued most likely to meet the requirements of the brisk trade relations which existed between India, Central and Western Asia, Egypt and Rome. In the early medieval period the paucity of coins is to be connected with the comparative decline in the volume of this foreign trade.

The silver coins of the period reveal a state of affairs which is by no means encouraging even when compared with that indicated by the gold coins of the period. Some kings and dynasties did not issue any silver coins, while others had to resort to heavily debased or billon coins. Thus in Kashmir the only king to issue silver coins was Harṣa. The Indo-Sassanian or gadahiyā coins are mostly of very base silver, so that at times it is difficult to be sure whether a given coin was meant

to be circulated as a copper coin or a silver one. It has been suggested that the so-called copper pieces were originally silver-plated and were meant to be used as silver coins.[1] This is however going to the other extreme. There are no doubt many coins which can easily be recognised as honest copper pieces. The coins of the Śāhi kings of Ohind were issued in both silver and copper. The analysis of one of the silver coins of this family reveals that it contains $\frac{894.6}{1000}$ silver, the balance being copper, with a trace of gold.[2] As compared with the silver coins of other kings of northern India these form a really satisfactory series. V.A.Smith[3] doubts if the Kalacuris either of Tripuri or of Ratnapura or the Candellas issued a silver currency. Their gold coins are generally so largely alloyed with silver that they can hardly be distinguished from silver coins and hence it is not unlikely that coins which appear to have been of silver were officially intended as gold coins. Among the Candella kings we have a solitary doubtful specimen of a silver coin of the reign of king Madanavarman. But this may have been intended to circulate as gold, like the heavily alloyed gold coins of the Candellas.[4] Likewise, though the coins

---

1. J.N.S.I., XV.218.
2. Proc.A.S.B., 1889, p.198.
3. C.C.I.M., I p.252.
4. Mitra, Early Rulers of Khajuraho, pp.183f.

of the Kalacuris of Ratnapura are found quite abundantly, there are only three silver coins all belonging to the reign of Pṛthvīdeva.[1] If these are honest silver coins, we can say that Pṛthvīdeva made a weak attempt to introduce a silver currency. He did not issue a large number of silver coins and the scheme had to be dropped by other kings of his family. The bull and horseman coins issued by the Tomaras, the Gāhaḍavālas, the Cāhamānas, the kings of Narwar and other unidentified Rajput kings[2] are mostly composed of billon, a mixture of silver and copper. The ratio of the two metals in these coins varies so much that the coins range from fairly good silver to merely pure copper. But the number of coins which can be classed as honest silver coins is limited indeed and most of the coins of these kings are to be branded as of highly debased silver or of billon.

The general paucity and debasement of silver coins may be connected with the decrease in the amount of silver which India could receive. In those times before the discovery of America the chief source of silver was Central Asia. The rise of the Arab power under the vigorous impact of Islam and the political disturbances which resulted in Central Asia must have affected

---

1. C.I.I., IV p. clxxxvii.
2. C.C.I.M., I pp.259-63.

the trade relations between India and these parts of Asia, with the consequent decline in the quantity of silver coming to India.[1]

The above survey must have made it clear that there was a general paucity of coins in this period which we have seen may have been due to the general cheapness of price, the feudal conditions of society and polity, the larger use of cowries for daily transactions and the draining of a considerable amount of coined money by the Muslim invaders. Side by side we find that the coins of the period show a debasement in metal as in weight. This we may connect with a general paucity of gold and silver in the period. Sometimes these features of the early medieval coins are traced to the unfavourable balance of trade which India is supposed to have suffered from in the period.[2] But though there was a general decline in the amount of India's foreign trade in this period it is difficult to believe that the evidence indicate an unfavourable balance of trade. And, as has been rightly pointed out by A.K.Majumdar[3], it is highly debatable if the economic forces, such as balance of trade, which operate in the modern world, had any influence in those

---

1. C.J.Brown, Coins of India, p.53.
2. N.R.Ray, Bāṅgālir Itihās q. by A.K.Majumdar, Chaulukyas of Gujarat, p.270.
3. Loc. cit.

days, when the mode of trading was entirely different.

x x x x x x x

In the early medieval period we find that though some of the major dynasties did not issue a regular currency and appear not to have minted many coins, some of the insignificant dynasties or kings issued considerable quantity of coins judged according to the conditions of the period. The Sena kings are not known to have issued any coins at all. For the Pālas we have only a very limited number of coins and their ascription is doubtful. We have only three copper coins of a unique type from Paharpur which are tentatively assigned to the early Pāla empire.[1] Scholars do not agree about ascribing the coins with the legend Śrī Vigra to king Vigrahapāla of the Pāla dynasty.[2] Recently a unique gold coin of king Devapāla has been discovered.[3] The coins of the Caulukyas, Paramāras and Kacchapaghātas are very few indeed and belong to the reigns of only one or two kings of these dynasties. For the Pratihāras, the Candellas, the Kalacuris of Tripuri and Ratnapura, the Gāhaḍavālas, the Cāhamānas and the Tomaras also we do not find coins for all the kings of the dynasties. As against this the comparatively

---

1. History of Bengal, I.667.
2. Cunningham, C.M.I., p.49; History of Bengal, I pp.667f; J.N.S.I., XIII.124.
3. J.N.S.I., XIII.123f.

insignificant dynasty of the Ṣāhi kings of Ohind issued an abundant currency.

What is even more remarkable is the fact that even the kings or dynasties who issued coins did not aim at a complete currency. Their coins are found only in one metal or two and then it is seldom that all the smaller denominations of a particular coin of a given weight standard seem to have been issued. The only exception to this general rule is provided by the coins of Gangeyadeva which are in all the three metals and are found in smaller denominations also.

We would suggest that the issuing of coins was viewed by kings as a matter of convenience. If there was already in circulation a sufficient number of coins or if the economic needs of the kingdom did not require fresh coins, the kings refrained from issuing them. We know that Gāṅgeyadeva was the only king of the Kalacuri family of Tripuri to mint coins.[1] It is likely that by his time there was felt that the existing currency is not sufficient and hence he introduced a complete coinage system. But as his successors thought that Gāṅgeyadeva's coins were enough for the kingdom they gave up issuing coins.

---

1. J.N.S.I., III.26. V.V.Mirashi ascribes eight gold coins with the name of Gāṅgeyadeva from Saugor district to Karṇa.

Sometimes coins were issued to proclaim some conquest on the part of the king concerned. Thus the Candella coins, which were struck after the coins of Gāṅgeyadeva, were most likely initiated by Kīrtivarman to signalise his victory over the Kalacuri king Lakṣmīkarṇa. Likewise the adoption of the seated goddess type by the Gāhaḍavāla king Govindacandra was done to proclaim some such victory achieved by the Gāhaḍavālas.

This apathy on the part of the ruling kings does not amount to their giving up the right to mint coinage. It is nclear however that people in this period did not always view the issuing of coins as the necessary sign of an independent ruler. Issuing of coins was an important function of the state but it was viewed according to the requirements for new coins and the fact that a certain king or dynasty did not issue any coin was not interpreted as bringing down their status.

References in the Rājataraṅgiṇī indicate that coined money was the right, privilege and concern of the state, though at times it did not perform the function or else gave a free hand to private concerns especially in the matter of gold coins. We have already referred to a minister under king Ananta as abolishing the royal privilege of marking the gold according to quality and price, in order to remove the chance

of oppression by later kings.[1] Another passage in the same text speaks of a City Prefect as remedying the long-standing abuse of the disuse of cash in commercial transactions.[2] The reference to false rūvagas (=rūpakas) in the Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi[3] of Jinadāsa written in c. 676 A.D., also makes a case for the coins being issued by the ruling authority and according to a certain standard of weight and purity of metal. Muhammad 'Aufī speaks of a certain Rai of India who conferred on his brother the chieftainship of Nahrwāla. This brother was of a wicked disposition and made counterfeit dirhams and circulated them in different parts of the country. The Rai on learning of this dishonest act sent an army and captured his brother.[4] This may indicate that the issuing of coins was the right of the sovereign king and he had to keep proper control over the currency circulating in his kingdom. The reference may also be made to show that the feudatory chiefs had no right to mint coins.

It would appear that in actual practice some of the merchants and bankers had also the permission s to mint coins, mostly gold coins. We have seen above that this fact is men-

---

1. VII.211f.
2. VIII.3334ff.
3. p.550 q. in J.N.S.I., XIV.108.
4. Elliot and Dowson, II.168.

tioned in a passage in the Rājataraṅgiṇī[1] and also in the Jāmi 'ul Hikāyāt.[2] The coins issued by any king carried with them a presumption and surety about their value. But it would appear that where large amounts were involved all coins were alike evalued according to their real value. In the Lekhapaddhati[3] the drammas involved in the transactions, even though they are mentioned as issued by king Viśvamalla (Bīsaladeva) and hence forming the regular currency, are referred to as being thrice examined (triparīkṣita). Significantly enough in an inscription from Dhod (Rajasthan) dated 1228 V.S.[4] 16 drammas with the name of Ajayadeva are said to have been tested before being accepted as the price of a house. Thus in actual practice, especially where large amounts were involved, the coins, whether of the local ruler or those issued by a king of another locality or dynasty, were alike tested and their value determined accordingly. Under such circumstances the coins minted by bankers had not much disadvantage. In an inscription from Chinchani (Thana) belonging to the middle of the tenth century[5] we find the transaction recorded in terms of money coined by a trader named Śreṣṭhin Gaṃbhuvaka who was most likely a banker of repute and trust.

---

1. VII.211f.
2. Elliot and Dowson, II p.188.
3. pp. 34, 43.
4. An. Rep. Rajputana Museum, Ajmer, 1922-23, p.2.
5. E.I., XXXII p. 60 ll.35-47.

CHAPTER XI - CONCLUSION

The periodisation of history is very desirable, because it helps to proper understanding by analysing the stages in its evolution. Though broad divisions are not difficult to make, real problems are created when one seeks sharp dividing lines. History is a continuous process and so it should not be divided into water-tight compartments. Any given tendency or institution has a long antecedent history before it finally emerges in a recognisable form, and likewise it continues to live in some form even after it seems to have ceased to exist. Thus in periodisation one can generally have only rough approximation and should not expect to find fixed dates.

In Indian history there is no completely agreed upon system of periodisation. It is fashionable with some text books to resort to the rough division into Hindu, Muslim and British periods on the basis of the people who had the predominant political power in the period. Another convenience in such a division is from the standpoint of teaching because of the difference in the language of the important source material for the three periods. This division implies several misconceptions of a basic nature and has therefore been rightly criticised[1]

---

1. U.N.Ghoshal, Studies in Indian History and Culture, pp. 245ff.

even though it has an air of rough simplicity.

Sometimes attempts have been made to apply such a division more strictly by taking a narrow interpretation of the term Hindu. Thus C.V.Vaidya[1] speaks of three periods in the early history of India, Aryan (c. 4000 or 2000 B.C.-300 B.C.), Aryo-Buddhist or Buddhist (c. 300 B.C.-600 A.D.) and Hindu (c. 600-1200 or 1300 A.D.). A similar suggestion is made by V.A.Smith who divides his Early History of India into three sub-periods, Ancient India (from the earliest times to c. 322 B.C.), Hindu India (c. 322 B.C.-647 A.D.) and Mediaeval Hindu Kingdoms or the Hindu period (c. 647-1200 or 1300 A.D.). But the use of the term 'Hindu' may give a wrong orientation and is, therefore, not happy.

The Marxist historians envisage fixed and definite periods having universal applicability, each characterised by productive relationships corresponding to a definite stage of development of the material productive forces. Without entering into a discussion of the soundness of the Marxist viewpoint, which sadly emphasises a part for the whole, we can praise it for focussing attention on the economic life of a country or people in a given period which has often been neglected by earlier

---

1. History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Vol. I, Preface, p. 1.

historians. In a purely economic study it is undoubtedly advantageous and desirable to keep in mind the Marxist approach. That the periods postulated by him do not strictly apply to Indian conditions was tacitly accepted by Marx himself when he referred to "the Asiatic mode of production". This however has not deterred an official party-line Marxist in India from distorting facts to fit them in the general scheme of periods.[1] It is conceded by an open-minded Marxist that "India showed a series of parallel forms which cannot be put into the precise categories, for the mode based on slavery is absent, feudalism greatly different from the European type with serfdom and the manorial economy".[2] It is therefore refreshing to find this scholar observing that "Marxism is far from the economic determinism which its opponents so often take it to be" and that "the adoption of Marx's thesis does not mean blind repetition of all his conclusions at all times".[3]

Generally, following the practice in European history, if the history of India is divided into Ancient, Medieval and Modern periods. Here we are not concerned with the last period, but the line of demarcation between the first two is by no means

---

1. S.A.Dange, India from Primitive Communism to Slavery.
2. D.D.Kosambi, An Introduction to the study of Indian History, p. 15, n. 14.
3. Ibid., p. 10.

easy to fix. Rapson[1] took the establishment of the Kuṣāṇa dynasty to represent the dividing line between the Ancient and Medieval periods. But this suggestion ignores the fact that the Gupta period, which represents the classical age of ancient Indian culture, comes after the Kuṣāṇas. The Kuṣāṇas did not bring about such fundamental changes as to mark the transition from the ancient period to medieval. Sir John Marshall[2] and F.J.Richards[3] seek to find in the rise of the Guptas the division between Ancient and Medieval India. This implies a wrong notion about the nature of the Gupta period, which, no doubt, was an age of the efflorescence and even of the culmination of some earlier tendencies but does not represent any violent break or significant transition from the preceding centuries. Some scholars regard the death of Harṣa as marking the change from the ancient to medieval times.[4] V.A.Smith regards the year 647 A.D. as marking an epoch in the history of India. But in recent studies this suggestion has been rejected, for it is based on the misconception that Harṣa was the last emperor in Indian history and that during the period after the death of Harṣa everything, including polity and religion, declined.[5]

---

1. Ancient India, p. 147.
2. Guide to Sanchi, p. 7.
3. Indian Antiquary, 1930 February.
4. Ishwari Prasad, History of Medieval India.
5. Cf. H.C.Ray, Dynastic History of Northern India, Vol. 1, Introduction, pp. xxxiv-xxxix.

H.C.Ray[1] accepts 916 A.D. as the line of demarcation between the two periods in the history of northern India because it saw the beginning of the break-up of the Gurjara-Pratihāra empire, the last great empire of northern India, after which we find a medley of petty states. He seems to have based his view on the fact that the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Indra III sacked Kanauj about the year 916. But this in itself does not mean much, because the Rāṣṭrakūṭas achieved similar successes even during the reigns of powerful kings like Vatsarāja and Nāgabhaṭa II. Moreover, Al-Mas'ūdī, who visited India in the year 915-16, testifies to the power, prestige and wide extent of the Pratihāra kingdom.[2] Though the Rāṣṭrakūṭa invasion undermined the prestige of the Pratihāras, the latter seem to have recovered at least a major part of their dominions, which even up to the middle of the tenth century extended from Surāṣṭra to Banaras in the east and Chanderi (Narwar) in the south.[3] No doubt after their disappearance there did not arise any empire in northern India which could compare with that of the Pratihāras, but we cannot ignore the imperial families of the Candellas, Paramāras,

---

1. Ibid., pp. xxxviii-xxxix.
2. Elliot and Dowson, I p. 21.
3. The Age of Imperial Kanauj, p. 36.

Caulukyas, Gāhaḍavālas and Cāhamānas. H.C.Ray[1] himself recognises 916 A.D. to be a weak dividing line when he describes the establishment of Muslim rule in most parts of northern India as "the final act of the drama" to which the incidents during the period of about three hundred years (c. 916 to 1200 A.D.) may be taken to be only a prelude. The year 916 may be conceded to have some political importance, though not of such a magnitude as to herald the beginning of a new period in the long history of India, but it can hardly be credited as having introduced any significant change in cultural life.

K.M.Munshi[2] regards 997 A.D. as the fateful year with which Ancient India ended and Medieval India began. In that year Mahmūd, son of Sabuktigīn, captured Ghaznī. The conquests made by Mahmūd led to the ultimate establishment of Muslim rule over northern India. Afghanistan and Punjab were brought under Muslim authority thus paving the way for its rapid extension. But it was only with the Mamlūk Sultāns of Delhi that Muslim power definitely established itself; for the intervening period of two hundred years the Muslims did not attempt an effective conquest of India to the east of Punjab. If the

---

1. Op. cit., p. xxxviii.
2. The Age of Imperial Kanauj, Foreword, pp. vii, xxiii. In his Foreword to the Struggle for Empire, p. viii he gives 1000 A.D. as the date dividing Ancient from Medieval India. In that year Mahmūd of Ghaznī first invaded India.

establishment of Muslim rule is to be treated as ushering the Medieval period the dividing line is to be placed towards the close of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century.[1]

We feel that in the absence of sharp divisions it would be safer to use round dates for dividing Indian history into convenient periods. We can profitably speak of an early Medieval period covering roughly five hundred years from 700 to 1200 A.D. and the Medieval period proper or late Medieval period which synchronised with the establishment of Muslim rule and may be said to have lasted until the establishment of British rule. In many respects the early medieval period prepared the ground for the later period, which basically represents a continuation of tendencies in the earlier one. The one fundamental difference between these two sub-periods is the presence of Muslims as rulers in the later period, and this accounts for most of the apparent differences. The fact that in the early medieval period the Muslims were not the dominant political power has often led scholars to bracket it with the Ancient period. The division of sections in the Indian History Congress seems to have been based on this idea. Thus Ancient India is divided into two sections the first up to 711 A.D. and the second from

1. U.N.Ghoshal, Studies in Indian History and Culture, pp. 252f.

712 to 1206, whereas Medieval India has two sections, 1206-1526 and 1526-1764. There is no basic difference between the two sections under Medieval India except the minor political consideration that before 1526 the political power was in the hands of the Turk and Afghan Sultāns and that year saw the establishment of the Mughal dynasty in India.

We feel that the period roughly from 700 to 1200 A.D. has more affinities with the subsequent centuries than with the preceding ones. There is of course the glaring difference that after 1200 A.D. Muslims were the politically dominant class. But even when viewed in the light of the question of the establishment of Muslim rule the period between 700 and 1200 A.D. can be regarded as the necessary prelude to subsequent times. The successful penetration of Muslim arms in India was a gradual process spread over many years. The beginning of the early Medieval period roughly synchronises with the first success achieved by the Muslims on Indian soil. The Arabs conquered Sind in 711-12. The early Medieval period witnessed the persistent effort of Muslims to conquer India and the success achieved in 1206 could not have been possible without the conquests of Sabuktigīn, his son Sultān Mahmūd of Ghaznī and Sultān Muhammad of Ghor. Thus the story of the establishment of Muslim power has to be traced back to 712 A.D.; it does

not begin abruptly in the year 1206.

V.A.Smith had observed that there was a general decline in everything from about 647.[1] The statement is a little exaggerated and is therefore rightly criticised.[2] In the early medieval period there are ~~xxxxx~~ important names in the different fields of art and scholarship who compare favourably with their counterparts in earlier times. What is however significant and which is often overlooked is the fact that there was not much original and creative activity in most aspects of cultural life. It was an age mostly of commentaries and digests and not of original works. The emphasis seems to have been on the preservation and explanation of the existing fund of knowledge. This tendency is found in legal writings, philosophical literature and works on astronomy, medicine and other similar technical branches. The literary works also do not reveal any freshness, but, bound to earlier conventions, excel in laboured and pedantic imitation of the past masters. The output in the field of art and architecture, though imposing in size and volume, is formal and conventional in approach, without much life and vigour. The intrusion of Islam accelerated the process of the decline of Indian culture which had started in the early medieval

---

1. Early History of India, pp. 371 f.
2. H.C.Ray, Dynastic History of Northern India, Introduction, pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

period. Unlike other foreign invaders of earlier periods the Muslims were not absorbed in the fold of Indian culture. On the contrary their cultural and religious antagonism expressed itself in persecution and proselytisation, and forced the Hindus to retire into protective shells. Naturally therefore the Hindus aimed rather at preserving their past cultural heritage than at attempting original and creative work. The resulting stagnation brought in its train cultural decadence. Thus we can interpret the late medieval period as another more advanced stage of the cultural decline which characterises the early medieval period.

There is another important consideration which indicates that the period roughly from the eighth century is to be studied as forming a unity with the period after the establishment of Muslim rule. We can describe the age of feudalism in Indian history as really beginning with the eighth century. It is in this sense that the period from 700 to 1200 A.D. is to be separated from the earlier centuries. Feudal tendencies appear no doubt towards the closing years of the Gupta rule, but clear references to the feudal practice of assigning fiefs to officers first appear in the reign of Harṣa. The period of confusion and absence of a strong central power after Harṣa probably favoured the rise of petty local chiefs. The inscriptions and

literary records of the early medieval period clearly indicate that even imperial dynasties had not much military power of their own and relied on the help of their feudatories, failing which they found themselves in a very miserable condition. If considered from the point of view of their feudal character the Gurȣjara-Pratihāras did not differ much from the subsequent dynasties, and so it would not be correct to place the beginning of the early medieval period in 916 as done by H.C.Ray.

The Muslim rule, alike under the Turko-Afghan Sultāns and the Mughal emperors, was based on the system of feudal assignments. The early Muslim rulers of necessity had to continue the existing Hindu machinery of administration. Even the later kings did not introduce much innovation in the details of the administration. Thus in its broad outline the administrative machinery in general and the feudal system in particular of the Muslim period were but a continuation of the early medieval institutions.

D.D.Kosambi[1] seems to have realised this fundamental unity of the period from Harȣa to the establishment of the British rule when he discussed the entire period under the head "feudalism from below". However, he oversimplifies the situation by

---

1. An Introduction to the Study of Indian History, Chs. IX and X.

bringing under this heading different types of feudalism, that of the early medieval period, that of the later Rajput period and that associated with the Turko-Afghan Sultāns and the Mughal kings. We would emphasise that Kosambi's expression "feudalism from below" is not a happy term. It conveys the impression that the establishment of feudal estates was generally independent of the authority of central government. Though there are no doubt some references to suggest that such a tendency was not altogether absent, we find that the creation of a landed aristocracy was generally the result of the policy of the central authority to grant villages to officers and feudatories besides brāhmaṇas and religious institutions. We may use the term feudalism, without qualification, because, ~~the term feudalism,~~ though there are certain important differences between Indian institutions and European feudalism, in their broad outline they show remarkable resemblance, and because even in Europe the feudal institutions differed so much from one place to another that F.W.Maitland was averse to calling feudalism a system and preferred to describe it as a complex.[1]

X X X X

We now attempt a brief estimate of the general economic

---

1. The Constitutional History of England, p. 143.

life in our period and its importance in the economic history of the country. It goes without saying that economic conditions were not uniform in all parts of the country. The differences in the climatic conditions, the economic products, and the political life in different areas created regional differences in the economic life. Likewise there must have been ups and downs in different periods. But we have not enough evidence to undertake a study of the regional and periodical differences in the economic life of the times.

It has been pointed out in a recent study that in the Gupta age "beneath the facade of outward splendour were the toiling masses on whose efforts the whole edifice depended".[1] But this is a historical truism applicable to all ages of ancient and medieval history not only of India and Oriental countries in general but of all human societies. It is however not to be denied that strangely enough this basic and commonplace fact is sometimes lost sight of even by scholars and so needs to be emphasised.

On the basis of the degree of economic prosperity society of our period may for the sake of convenience be classified into the commonly used divisions of upper, middle and lower

---

1. S.K.Maity, Economic Life in the Gupta period, p. 190.

classes, without implying that any such divisions were actually recognised in those times, and with the reservation that these three classes had many gradations.

The upper class included the kings, feudal chiefs, ministers and state officers, big merchants and prosperous brāhmaṇas. We get an idea of the splendour and the luxury at the court and the magnificence associated with the life of kings from the Mānasollāsa, though strictly speaking this text does not belong to the geographical limits under consideration. According to this text the royal palace should have one to nine stories, should be whitewashed, should have in some parts latticed passages and in others dark passages illuminated by jewelled lamps, should have an ivory fencing and pillars of gold or sandal-wood, floor of glass or crystal and walls of crystal mirror-like slabs.[1] The text discusses elaborately the different aspects of the life of a king, his luxurious dress and toilet, his rich dietary and sumptuous banquets and his recreations and pastimes which all reveal luxurious and expensive magnificence. We have ample references from other sources confirming this account of royal pomp and grandeur. Thus the Naiṣadhīyacarita[2] gives a vivid picture of the splendour and luxury of the royal palace.

---

1. III.123-29.
2. XVIII.5-27.

Bilhaṇa in his Vikramāṅkadevacarita[1] describes how the recreations of a king were made to vary according to different seasons. A royal palace included a concert hall, a theatre, a gymnasium, a dancing hall and a picture-gallery.[2] The works of Rājaśekhara reflect the pomp and ostentation in the royal palace. He describes the costly ornaments and unguents and perfumes used by the royal ladies[3] and refers to such objects of luxury in a palace as a plantain-arbour with a raised emerald seat,[4] a sleeping-chamber with perforated columns and a jewelled quadrangle and a crystal house with pictures on the wall.[5] In describing the court of the Cāhamāna king Pṛthvīrāja the Kharataragaccha-paṭṭāvalī refers to the throne as being rainbow-shaped and embedded with jewels of various colours and to the walls and the floors of the court as shining with bright jewels and precious stones.[6] Kalhaṇa makes pointed reference to royal ostentation in Kashmir, which seems to have attained its climax under king Harṣa (A.D. 1089-1101). His numerous palaces shone forth with wonderful splendour and had golden āmalaka ornaments and buildings which reached the clouds. Of these the palace of hundred

---

1. XII.50-78.
2. Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra, XV.18f.
3. Karpūramañjarī, II; Viddhaśālabhañjikā, II and III.
4. Karpūramañjarī, II.
5. Viddhaśālabhañjikā, I.
6. Hindustānī, 1940 pp. 82ff.
7. VII.938.

gates was especially remarkable for its grandeur.[1] The ladies in the harem of Harṣa used costly garments and unguents and covered their bodies with gold ornaments.[2] Nobody in his court was seen without brilliant dress, without gold ornaments, with a small following or without a resolute bearing. On journeys the ministers would always be mistaken for the king. King Harṣa introduced the bright and gaudy court costumes fashionable in south India.[3]

The petty feudal chiefs imitated the pomp and grandeur of emperors. But the luxuries which they enjoyed were dependent on the resources which they could command and hence their magnificence could only reflect the royal splendour on a smaller scale. The ministers and other high state officers who often received villages differed little from the feudal chiefs and lived a similar life of luxury and show.

The Kuṭṭanīmata[4] describes the dress and bearing of a young son of an officer in the king's service which may be taken to represent the class of petty landed chiefs and state officers. He wears finger rings and ear-rings of a distinctive type and has thin golden threads around his neck. His limbs are yellowish with the saffron rubbed on his body. His shoes have ornamen-

---

1. Raj. VII.1550.
2. Raj. VII.928-31.
3. Raj. VII.881-3, 895, 994, 946-9.
4. vv. 61-70.

tal designs. His clothes dyed yellow with saffron have a gold border. Whenever he comes out in public he is accompanied by a number of attendants, including a betel-casket bearer and five or six armed men.

The big merchants of this period rivalled the kings in their affluence and their way of living was quite royal. The Moharājaprājaya[1] of Yaśaḥpāla describes the oppulence and grandeur of the mansion of a millionaire (koṭīśvara) merchant under the Caulukya king Kumārapāla. Huge banners with ringing bells were hoisted over the mansion to proclaim the owner's status as a koṭīśvara. He maintained alms-houses and owned a large number of horses and elephants. The main building was approached by a stair-case of crystal. The mansion included a temple with crystal floor and with walls, which were adorned with religious paintings and which enshrined an image in emerald. Even the king when he visited the mansion was wonder-struck to see the rich stores of gold, silver and jewels.

The Kāvyamīmāṃsā[2] of Rājaśekhara describes the ideal surroundings for a poet. In this we can easily see the comfortable life which a cultured man of good resources was expected to live in this period. He should have his nails properly cut,

---

1. Act III pp. 53ff.
2. X p. 49.

should chew betel-leaves, anoint his body with unguents, put on costly, though not gaudy, garments and deck his head with flowers. His residence should have arrangements suiting the requirements of different seasons. It should have a garden-house with an awning of numerous trees, a miniature hill, tanks and ponds, a collection of tame birds and animals, a shower-house with paved floor, a creeper-bower and also swings and hammocks.

In the records of our period we have several references to indicate that the general standard of living was high and people were used to many items of comfortable and prosperous living. The literary references show that golden and jewelled ornaments for the different parts of the body were much in vogue.[1] The sculptures of this period also reveal a marked tendency for massive ornamentation and elaborate jewellery.[2] We get a general idea of the amenities which were associated with the concept of a comfortable life from the Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[3] which mentions couches with soft cotton sheets, seats filled with goose feathers, gowns and other soft garments, upper garments,

---

1. Kāvyamīmāmsā, VI p. 27.
2. Cf. S.Kramrisch in Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art, XV pp. 178ff.
3. p. 220.

woollen-cloth, silks, including Chinese, musk, aloes, sandal, and other unguents as things delightful to the touch. The literary works are full of references to the luxurious behaviour of ladies changing their cosmetics according to the different seasons. Thus we learn that at the end of the winter and the beginning of the spring season the maidens start using sandal-juice and give up the use of bees' wax for their lips, fragrant oil for their hair and thick saffron for their mouths.[1] In the evening the jewelled roof-terraces and the picture galleries are opened for pleasure, the couches are spread out by the attendants and the maids-in-waiting move their fingers on the silks.[2] At the rise of the full moon aloes are burnt as incense at the pleasure-houses where rare pearls are suspended as festoons and charming pleasure-couches are prepared.[3] In summer people delighted in rubbing themselves with sandal-paste at midday, playing in bathing-pools until nightfall, and drinking cool liquor at evening.[4] The Ratirahasya[5] testifies to the popularity of excursions to gardens (udyānayātrā), excursions for drinking (pānayātrā) and water-sports (jalāvatāra). The description of the spring revels found in the Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā[6]

---

1. Karpūramañjarī, I.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., III.
4. Ibid., IV.
5. XIII.93.
6. pp. 590-603.

reveals a spirit of joy and abandon which reflects a prosperous society. On the appointed day people flocked to the garden outside the city and engaged themselves in different sports, while gallant lovers drank with their mistresses goblets of scented wine from bejewelled drinking vessels. People sang and danced and formed themselves into many drinking parties or else engaged in amorous sports. Later on the king also came to join the festivity and revelry and was welcomed with song, dance, play of musical instruments, the sprinkling[1] of sandal and saffron juice and similar exuberant manifestations of gaiety. Medhātithi[1] mentions the professions of several personal servants, catering for the needs of a man of means who wants to live a luxurious life.

The general prosperity in our period can easily be inferred from the references to the use of objects of luxury some of which we have noticed above. There is nothing to suggest that there was any appreciable decline in agriculture or industries.[2] On the contrary we have good evidence about the advanced knowledge of the technique of cultivation.[3] Some of the industries

---

1. On Manu IX.76, 143.
2. The Age of Imperial Kanauj, pp. 399-404; The Struggle for Empire, pp. 516-24.
3. The Kṛṣiparāśara and the sayings of Khanā.

such as textiles, working of metals, especially iron, copper and bronze, the art of jewellery, leather work, wood-carving, stone-work and ivory-carving had achieved a degree of technical skill.[1] We have seen that in this period India still exported many articles to neighbouring countries and Indian merchants carried a profitable trade with them.[2] The Muslim accounts also show the prosperity of northern India at the time of the Muslim invasions. Arab geographers also refer to the prosperity of the different parts of northern India. Al-Idrīsī speaking about ~~the~~the general conditions in India observes that "provisions are abundant, and the taxes are light, so that the people are in easy circumstances".[3] Some of the indigenous records also speak of the prosperity of specific regions in particular periods.[4]

But this is not to imply the idealised generalisation that the prosperity was shared by all the sections in society. It has been pointed out that the poorest man of the time seems to have been fairly well off, for some images at Khajuraho also show some crude jewellary on their persons.[5] It is however not safe to base an inference on this evidence. The art of this

---

1. The Age of Imperial Kanauj, pp. 400ff; The Struggle for Empire, pp. 517-20.
2. See supra pp. 211-27, 237-41, 248-53.
3. Elliot and Dowson, I p. 82.
4. E.g., a private inscription from Mallar says that under the Kalacuris the country was well-governed and was free from the infestation of troubles, and the people were happy-C.I.I., IV No. 97, ll.9-10. Cf. the account of the prosperity of Rāja Māṇikcandra's subjects as found in the Maināmatī songs which reflects the conditions in the days of Hindu rule-T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, pp. 86f.
5. Uttara Bharatī, II no. 2, p.164

period, including sculpture was to a great extent conventionalised[1] and so is not very faithful in reflecting the minute details of social life. Moreover the ornaments depicted on the persons of the poor are not to be interpreted as being valuable ones. The literary works of the period make this point quite clear. The ornaments used by the lower class are often described as being of cheap metals or objects. Thus we find that the betel-casket bearer, who in the Kuṭṭanīmata is said to accompany the young son of an officer, uses a garland of thick glass beads around his neck and conch-shell bangles on his wrist.[2] There are other references also to women of poor class using ornaments made of conch-shell.[3]

Nevertheless the general condition even of the lower classes could not have been very bad because prices in general were low. Prices continued to be low in any case upto the time of Ibn Batūta.[4] We get some idea of the cost of living in our period from the Kolhapur Plates of Gaṇḍarādityadeva dated 1126 A.D.[5] It would follow from this inscription that two nivartanas of land were sufficient to provide for twelve brāhmaṇas rich food with cooked rice of white grains (śvetavrīhyodana), with broth

---

1. K.De B.Codrington, Medieval Indian Sculptures, p. 17.
2. vv. 66-67.
3. E.g., Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, v. 1152.
4. Yule, Cathay, IV. 80-82.
5. E.I., XXIII.30-32.

(sūpa) made of āḍhakī and other pulses, with ghee, whey (takra) and four vegetables and betel-leaves (tāmbūla).

There are certain indications to suggest wide differences in the standard of living among the social groups. Thus we learn from the Rājataraṅgiṇī that whereas the courtiers ate fried meat and drank wine cooled and perfumed with flowers[1], the common people had to be content with rice and utpalaśāka (a wild vegetable of bitter taste)[2]. Likewise, whereas the rich enjoyed luxurious theatre-halls, filled with leather-cushioned couches[3], the common man witnessed theatrical performances under an open sky and in case of a downpour had to disperse.[4] The Sandeśarāsaka points out that men of taste sometimes being hard-pressed find betel-leaves beyond their reach and have to console themselves with the modest śatapatrī.[5] From the Dāyabhāga[6] it appears that sometimes housewives found the earnings of their husbands insufficient and had to take to spinning, weaving or some other mechanical art. In the story books we often read about the hardships which a poor man or woman had to face.[7] The Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita[8] relates the story of the miserable

---

1. VIII.1866.f
2. V.49.
3. Kuttanīmata, v. 68.
4. Rāj., VII.1606.
5. v. 18.
6. p. 85.
7. Bṛhatkathākośa, XLII.4f; Prabandhacintāmaṇi, pp. 10 (l.13), 12 (ll.2f), 93 (l.21), 109 (ll.25f).
8. (Tr.) III p. 248.

lot of a woman afflicted with poverty, who earned a living by working in other people's houses, spent the whole day in threshing, grinding, carrying water, sweeping the house, smearing the house with cow-dung and similar work and took her food after the whole day had passed.

It would appear that even the most benevolent king would sometimes fail to appreciate the miserable lot of the poor and would add to their existing difficulties. Thus the Prabandhacintāmaṇi[1] records a tradition that in his desire to establish learned men in his capital king Bhoja ordered the weavers and fishermen to be removed from their localities where houses were (to be) built for the scholars.

We learn from the literary sources of the period that in spite of the general prosperity some people suffered abject poverty and had to resort to begging in order to maintain themselves.[2] In the disgusting picture of the Kali age as given in the Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa[3], which reflects the existing conditions to some extent, people are said in general to have little property. Medhātithi refers to gleaners, who, after wandering about several villages, earned just enough to serve as food for

---

1. p. 29 l. 17.
2. Cf. Abhidhānaratnamālā, vv. 348, 351, 359-61 for such terms.
3. XXXVIII.34 - alpārthāśca bhaviṣyanti.

the day.[1] Elsewhere Medhātithi refers to the starving condition of the family as one of the main causes which led people to commit offences.[2] The Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa has by way of illustration a sentence which means that a certain person is starving due to hunger.[3] As these illustrations were about things which were quite well-known to young boys for whom the text was meant, it would follow that poverty bordering on starvation was by no means unknown. Hemacandra in his Triṣaṣṭiśalakapuruṣacarita[4] notices the truism that generally thw women of the poor conceive quickly. Such an appreciation could not have been the result of imagination or theorisation, but reveals a realistic knowledge of the phenomenon of poverty and one of its underlying causes. Kṣemendra, who is known for his genius in presenting faithful sketches of the representative characters of his time, makes occasional references to the behaviour of poor men. Thus in his Aucityavicāracarcā[5] he refers to a stranger who sits uninvited in the middle of the line of many people taking food but is found out at last and proves himself a source of shame and disgust. He quotes Māgha to the effect that hungry stomachs

---

1. On Manu VIII.260.
2. Ibid. 126.
3. p. 51 l. 14 - Bhūkhem sukhā (Skt. Bubhukṣāyā śuṣyati).
4. I.1.533 (Tr. I p. 53) - prāyeṇa hi daridrāṇāṃ śīghragarbhabhṛtaḥ striyaḥ.
5. p. 22.

cannot live upon grammar nor can thirsty mouths drink the juice of poetry and that nobody even rescued a family by learning, hence all the arts are useless and one should earn gold alone.[1] In his Suvṛttatilaka[2] he points out that the poor, who have limited resources, cannot enjoy a festival.

Even x in some of the big cities there were many people who had no regular income and had to support themselves by the most degraded devices. The Bṛhatkathākośa[3] of Hariṣeṇa has a story about the miserably unhappy poor men who lived in a separate locality in the city of Ujjayinī. Of these a certain Viṣṇudatta with great difficulty supported his family by beating his heart and head with hard stones in his hand, by holding bundles of grass with his teeth in the centre of the market place or by entertaining people with sweet songs. The realistic details of these methods, which such people adopt in modern India also, suggest that the author knew these social groups well and had not produced them out of his imagination.

It has been recently pointed out by D.D.Kosambi that the poverty of his particular class seems to be the only reality with which the poets of the classical period came to grips.[4] In

---

1. Ibid., p. 26.
2. III.26.
3. III.3-6.
4. Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, Introduction, p. xliii. See also D.D. Kosambi, Śatakatrayādisubhāṣitasaṃgraha, Introduction, p.81.

the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa there are some verses referring to the miserable plight of a poor brāhmaṇa. For his sustenance he has to humour a farmer by praising him so that he may give him a handful of chaff.[1] With a tattered umbrella in his hand and tormented by hunger a brāhmaṇa acolyte returns home with tired legs after wandering for the whole day for his meagre alms.[2] Here we are not concerned with the propriety of a class theory being the suitable guide to the excellence of a literature.[3] Though Indian literature does not aim at realism in the restricted sense of an awareness of the clashes of the bourgeois and the proletariat,[4] it would be incorrect to say that it is unrealistic as not reflecting the existing institutions. Sanskrit poetry has its own ideas and ideals and in achieving them it abides by certain conventions and sometimes encourages laboured effects, but does not always sacrifice spontaneity.[5] The accounts are sometimes consciously overdrawn and exaggerated, but they cannot be said to be devoid of a substratum of truth. Even the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, which belongs to the class of subhāṣita literature intended primarily for amusement (vinoda),[6] about

---

1. v. 305.
2. v. 1170.
3. H.H.Ingalls, Preface to the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, p. x.
4. Cf. S.P.Bhattacharyya in J.N.Banerjea Volume, p. 135.
5. Ibid., pp. 134f.
6. Ibid., p. 134.

which the remark of Kosambi has special applicability, has many graphic pen-sketches of a highly realistic character.[1] The poverty of a section of the brāhmaṇas is a historical reality for all periods of Indian history. The Prabandhacintāmaṇi has some stories about poor brāhmaṇas, whose only means of subsistence was begging[2] or whose only possession was an aged bull[3] or a tattered wrapper.[4] Another brāhmaṇa tells his woeful tale : he has no wrapper for protection against cold or a brazier for fire; his back is bruised from sleeping on the ground; there is nothing to stop draught from entering his hut; he has not even a handful of rice to eat; he has no peace of mind for a single moment and is harassed by his creditors.[5]

There are several indications to suggest that the life of a villager, in particular of a cultivator, was by no means an enviable one and he had to be satisfied with basic necessities only. The Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa has a number of verses reflecting the poverty of the villagers. The family of a householder has many members, but a single ox, the only possession of the family, is too exhausted to get up, making the future all the more

---

1. See vv. 1176, 1179, 1181, 1162, 300 for descriptions of some aspects of village life.
2. p. 42, l. 16.
3. p. 8, l. 25.
4. p. 103, l. 12.
5. p. 29, ll. 13f.

gloomy.[1] An entire family has just one room which contains the kitchen, the mortar, the household furniture and the householder and his children; above all this the housewife will provide an addition to the family within a day or two and has to spend her labour time in that very room.[2] A poor housewife is in real trouble in her old house when it rains heavily; with a piece of broken winnowing basket on her head, she dries śaktuṁ which has become lumped, consoles crying children, throws out water in a broken earthen pot and protects the bed made of grass.[3] Another poor householder has to bear the sight of his children looking like corpses with bodies emaciated with hunger; his relatives are scornful; the worn out water-jar leaks and his wife daily begs from the neighbour the loan of a needle to mend her torn garment, only to receive her sarcasm and anger.[4] A famished householder consoles his wife with the wishful thinking that with their pumpkins which they will grow without labour by their hovel at the end of the summer season they will feed themselves like a king.[5] A housewife relies only on pumpkins for her family but does not get a bounteous crop because the water which she borrows from well-wishers leaks through the

---

1. v. 1317.
2. v. 1310.
3. v. 1312.
4. v. 1307.
5. v. 1306.

cracked pot and she cannot water them.[1] The shy children of the poor are said often to cast greedy glances at richer people eating their meals.[2] A poor mother wishes that the night might never pass and thus stop the worries about food which she will face tomorrow.[3] Another mother with emaciated body and torn clothes whose children clamour for food wishes fervently that one māna of rice may suffice for them for one hundred days.[4] In two verses of the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa a traveller on approaching a house for food and shelter finds the householder in abject poverty and so returns without expressing his request.[5] In the Sūktimuktāvalī[6] of Jalhaṇa belonging to the early part of the thirteenth century humble dwellings and harrowing poverty were often regarded as characteristic of village life. That such descriptions had some realistic basis and were not the result of poetic conventions would follow from a poem of Ḍheṇḍaṇapāda, a mystic saint. He speaks of his house as standing on a solitary hillock, with no rice in the earthen pot and all the inmates very hungry.[7]

---

1. v. 1315.
2. v. 1320.
3. v. 1311.
4. Saduktikarṇāmṛta, p. 310.
5. vv. 1314, 1328.
6. p. 441.
7. Bauddha Gān O' Dohā, pada, no.33.

The Avadānakalpalatā[1] of Kṣemendra presents a peasant as the veritable embodiment of poverty and misery. He is working hard in his field. His hair is tawny with dust; his hands and feet are cracked; he is tormented with hunger and thirst and he is pained by the cuts he has received in the course of his work. Kṣemendra further speaks of the sons of well-to-do householders who are forced by poverty to accept slavery and who, emaciated with hunger, toil wearily in the fields.[2] In the Caryāgīti we have a reference to peasants in tattered wrappers who are too poor to buy ploughshares.[3] The economic backwardness of the cultivator affected his social status. For Vācaspatimiśra,[4] the Sāṃkhya philosopher of this period, the peasant with his feet covered with dust was the best example of the mentally undeveloped.[5]

A villager was satisfied with very little and did not seriously try to obtain the amenities and comforts of the well-to-do townsmen. The conception of a happy life in a village which we find in the works of this period indicates that the standard of living in the country was really low. Thus in the

---

1. XXIV. 94-96.
2. Ibid., XVII. 14.
3. Dohākośa, p. 333.
4. Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī, p. 17 ll. 1-3 - Tatra vyaktaṃ svarūpataḥ pāṃsulapādako hāliko'pi pratyakṣataḥ pratipadyate.
5. I.A., 1933, p. 17.

Prabandhacintāmaṇi[1] a householder who owns four bulls and two cows and has a sweet-tongued wife is said to be really fortunate. Babbara, the court poet of the Kalacuri king Karṇa, describes the ideally happy villager as having saintly, obedient, meritorious and learned sons with minds fixed on their dharma, a pious-minded, faithful and modest wife, absorbed in virtuous deeds, loyal servants, and a neat and clean house with high walls and well thatched.[2] According to the same source the food of such a fortunate farmer consisted of hot rice on green plantain leaf, with cow's ghee and milk, fish and nāliya (nālitā) vegetable.[3]

We can safely conjecture that some of the general causes which are responsible for reducing people to poverty in other countries and periods existed in our period also. We have seen in some of the references quoted above that the poor man describes himself as harassed by his creditors. Probably the high rates of interest and the exacting ways of the merchant-creditors were responsible for much distress. Thus the Kuṭṭanīmata tells of a man losing his fortune through the exactions of usurers.[4] Likewise Medhātithi refers to the practice in some parts of the country of the debtor repaying the debt by selling

---

1. p. 24, l. 3.
2. R.Sāṅkṛtyāyana, Hindī Kāvya Dhārā, p. 314.
3. Ibid., p. 316.
4. v. 615.

himself.[1]

The popular imagination, divorced from historical reality, which seeks solace from present sufferings by projecting an idealised golden age of plenty in the past, likes to believe that famines were non-existent in earlier times.[2] The paucity of relevant evidence[3] may appear to corroborate this. But a proper analysis will reveal that famines were far more frequent and distressing in effect than those in modern times. Famines and the sufferings accompanying them seem to have been quite a common phenomenon.[4] In describing the typical condition of the Kali age, in which is reflected the contemporary life, the Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa says that people will be gravely distressed by famine and will migrate to countries rich in wheat and barley.[5] The Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita refers to famines "terrible with universal destruction".[6] The Aparājitapṛcchā[7] realises the tremendous loss brought about by famines. Under the stress of famines dharma declines, and the subjects and the rulers alike

---

1. On Manu VIII.46.
2. I.A., 1923, p. 108.
3. Ibid., pp. 192f.
4. Cf. Russelkonda (Ganjam) Plates of Neṭṭabhañja, E.I., XXVIII. 262-kalikalahadimva-ḍaṃmara-taskara-durbhikṣa-rogāpagata; Prabandhacintāmani, p.35 l.26; Samayamātṛkā, II.60; Ukti-vyaktiprakaraṇa, p.39 ll.3-4; Upadeśataraṅginī vv. 137f q. in Hindī Kāvya Dhārā, p. 392.
5. XXXVIII.87.
6. (Tr.) I p. 331.
7. p. 187 v. 24.

suffer. The literary works of the period often refer to famines lasting for twelve years.[1] In one of the documents in the Lekhapaddhati[2] a son addresses his father as one who supports members of his caste during famine and also as one who provides food to people during famine. It would appear from this that famines often visited different parts of the country. Firishta refers to a famine of 1033 which raged in Hindustan with considerable violence and as a result of which many countries were entirely depopulated.[3] The Prabandhacintāmaṇi[4] mentions a famine which visited Gujarat during the reign of the Caulukya king Bhīma. Another famine in this region is recorded in the Jagaḍucarita[5] as having occurred under Vīsaladeva. From the Rajatarangini we learn of two dreadful famines in Kashmir in 917-18 during the reign of Pārtha[6] and in 1099-1100 under Harṣa.[7]

Generally famines resulted from drought.[8] The Aparājitapṛcchā regards this as the most important cause of famines and hence advises kings to provide for irrigation so that their

---

1. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p.34 l.7; Dharmaparīkṣā, IV. See also Kathākosa, p. 169.
2. pp.30f-durbhikṣe svajātipoṣakān and durbhikṣe pālanaparān.
3. Briggs, History of the Rise of Muhammadan Power, I p.103.
4. p. 30 l.20.
5. VI.71-90.
6. V.270-78.
7. VIII.1206ff.
8. Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 30 l.20.

kingdoms may be free from the fear of famines.[1] The Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa[2] in its description of the Kali age says that people will have fear of drought and with eyes directed towards the sky will apprehend the sufferings of hunger; through drought they will lead the life of ascetics, eating only roots, leaves and fruits and will even commit suicides. But the Agni Purāṇa[3] attaches equal importance to absolute drought and excessive rain as causes of famine and mentions mantras to be recited on the occasion of a river's changing its former channel, or receding from, or encroaching upon the site of a village or a town, or on the occasion of a fountain, tank, pool or any other natural reservoir of water running dry. Even to-day, when so much effort has been made to keep them in control, the rivers in northern India often swell, to spread devastation, misery and famine. The Kathākoṣa[4] refers to famines coming from too much rain. The Viśeṣa-śataka of Samayasundara Gaṇin[5] speaks of an entire janapada being completely flooded as a result of incessant rains for fifteen days. The two dreadful famines of

---

1. pp. 187-88, vv. 21-41.
2. XXXVIII.80f.
3. CCLXIII.19-21.
4. p. 161.
5. q. by Pran Nath, Economic Conditions of Ancient India, p. 47 f.n. 4.

Kashmir which we have referred to above were the direct consequence of devastating floods.

In those days of slow communication the famine-stricken areas could not expect early relief from other areas. We find no reference to any system to prevent famines and economic institutions were not adjusted to withstand the reverses resulting from the natural calamities. We read about charitable help which magnanimous merchants extended to the sufferers[1] but these could have been at the best in the nature of providing them with food and clothing and could hardly be expected to have aimed at rehabilitating them. The responsibility of the king to provide relief on these occasions is clearly recognised in the texts of the period.[2] Medhātithi[3] speaks of the king supporting his subjects by giving them corn from his granary. But the state did not think in terms of strengthening the financial reserves of the people, and of the peasants in particular, to enable them to escape the evil consequences of the failure of the crops.

Moreover, there were some anti-social elements who wanted to exploit the famines forg greater gain and who thus added to

---

1. Lekhapaddhati, pp. 30f; Jagaducarita, VI.71-90.
2. Cf. Aparājitapṛcchā, pp. 187f.
3. On Manu V.93.

the sufferings of the people. Kṣemendra in his Deśopadeśa[1] describes a typical avaricious and miserly merchant of his times who hoards but does not sell paddy and other grains, even though he has kept it for sixty years; at the time of drought or excessive rains he dances with joy and welcomes a famine or any other public calamity because he can then get good money for his hoarded grain. Likewise some hard-hearted kings did not realise their duty at the time of famines and instead increased the hardship of the people by their oppressive measures. The Aparājitapṛcchā[2] recognises the possibility that famines become particularly horrible if the ruling king is cruel, probably implying that he not only did not arrange any welfare measures but did not remit the state dues and tried to exploit the suffering people. The history of Kashmir in this period substantiates this fear. We learn that on the occasion of the famine of 917 the king's minister and the tantrins became wealthy from selling stores of rice at high prices; the king would take that person as minister who raised money by selling the wretched subjects. King Harṣa had imposed fresh imposts over and above the existing ones. When the great

---

1. II.33f.
2. p. 187 v. 27.

famine of 1099-1100 A.D. occurred, he did not reduce his rigorous taxation and continued to exact heavy fines. Kalhaṇa very aptly remarks that the heavy taxes were just like a boulder placed on an old bullock worn out by dragging the plough.[1]

The feudalisation of the state structure in our period and the emergence of petty feudal chiefs was bound to have an adverse effect on the economic system in general. We have abundant evidence to prove that the burden of the taxation system was heavy.

In the inscriptions of the period we find revenue terms such as akṣapaṭalaprastha, pratīhāraprastha, cauroddharaṇa, duḥsādhyādāya, paṭṭakilādāya and talārābhāvya.[2] These stand for dues which the villagers had to pay to these officers over and above the different dues which they paid to the state. This indicates the feudal practice of the period of remunerating state officers in terms of land-grants and assignments of revenue. The Deśīnāmamālā[3] mentions grāmaroḍā and koḍio as people who enjoy villages by deceitful manipulation. These represented a class of chieftains who taking advantage of the central authority established their power and realised dues

---

1. Rāj., VII.1225.
2. See supra pp. 106-7, 110, 113-4, 117.
3. IV.48, 90.

from villagers, though they were not recognised by the established authority.

Though in general the vassals were required to collect the dues and to pay tributes or periodical dues to their overlord, there is some evidence to indicate that the tax-collecting rights of the kings and their subordinate chiefs were not mutually exclusive and the poor farmer had to pay separate dues to the latter. The Dvyāśrayakāvya[1] shows that the village lord (grāmapati) and the king realised separate shares of the produce after the harvest. The resulting burden on the taxation system can be realised from the fact that the records of the period indicate several grades of rulership and of sub-infeudation.[2]

The feudatories needed money. They had to pay tributes to their overlord, had to maintain a strong army not only for self-preservation in those days of frequent internecine wars but also for expanding their territories, and tried to maintainn a high show of luxury and grandeur in imitation of the highest rulers of the times. The Vikramāṅkadevacarita[3] of Bilhaṇa

---

1. III.2. See also Bṛhat-Parāśara (Jivananda) III p. 113.
2. Ratanpur stone inscription of the reign of the Caulukya king Kumārapāla-P.Peterson, Collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, p.206; see also Lekhapaddhati, p.7.
3. Sarga IV.

indicates how the feudatories needed money for their armies and wars. A feudatory of king Vikrama, who was his own brother, wanted to increase his army with a view to successfully rebelling against his overlord, and thus amassed a treasure by extortion.

The feudatory rulers appear to have been in the look out for new methods of realising money from their subjects and exploited every opportunity that presented itself. Two inscriptions from the Caulukya kingdom show that the prohibition of the killing of animals on certain days which king Kumārapāla promulgated out of sincere x religious conviction was utilised by two of his feudatories for raising money by imposing fines on those who disobeyed the orders.[1] The Vastupālacarita[2] tells of a māṇḍalika who extracted heavy presents and bribes from the people. The Udayasundarīkathā[3] of Soḍḍhala refers to a feudal chief who imprisoned rich people to extract money from them. The Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa[4] in its description of the Kali age observes that the servants of the state torture even the brāhmaṇas for the sake of money. In the Laṭakamelaka[5] of Saṅkhadhara Saṅgrāmavisara, who typefies a rājaputra chief (rāuttarāja)

---

1. Prakrit and Sanskrit Inscriptions, pp. 172f, 206f.
2. p. 100b.
3. p. 56.
4. XXXVIII.50.
5. Act II p.18.

enjoying the assignment of a village (grāmapaṭṭaka), is said to have made money even from sparrows, dead-birds, pig-dung and the shrouds of dead bodies. The Kathāsaritsāgara[1] also refers to the exactions of people by a petty sāmanta and the obnoxious rules and regulations promulgated by him. It appears from Al-Bīrūnī[2] that in order to escape from the heavy burdens of taxation poor villagers concealed their property from royal officers. We can infer the usual ways of a feudal chief from the unusual concessions which the benevolent king Kālaketu of the Caṇḍikāvya offers to a new settler. "I won't seize your produce from the field, but shall wait till you pay me off in cowries at your convenience and shall not depute any tax-collector to realise taxes from you. If you really mean to remain in Gujarat, I won't demand anything in the shape of selāmis, bānsgāris, pāravanis and pañcaks, and also I won't charge boat-tax, salt-tax, loom-tax and paddy cutting tax or demand anything on the plea of mistakes in the account-books. However much you may sell of your good paddy, I won't covet a share....I won't take any house-rent from those of you who are new settlers in my city.[3]

---

1. Lambaka 3, taraṅga 18. Cf. Kṣemendra's Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, III.200f.
2. II.149.
3. T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, pp. 312f.

The oppressive taxes could not but adversely effect the economy of the villages, bringing the villagers to a very low level of subsistence. A verse in the Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa[1] describes the ruined condition of a village which was depopulated as a result of exactions by the feudal chief. The description of the Kali age in the Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa[2] speaks of people fleeing from exorbitant taxation to countries rich in corn. The baneful effects of the burdensome taxes of the period are best reflected in the Maināmatī songs which describe the evil consequences for Māṇikacandra's subjects who were very opulent before a new chief came to rule the land under king Māṇikacandra. This man imposed exorbitant taxes with the result that people sold everything including ploughs and other agricultural implements, and even their own children; the widows and the poor suffered all the more terribly. Ultimately the tāluks were turned into jungles.[3]

We find no reference to suggest that the overlords made any serious efforts to stop these exactions of the feudal chiefs. As the central authority in the period had declined considerably and had to depend on the levies sent by the feudal chiefs, it

---

1. v. 1175.
2. XXXVIII.87.
3. T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, p. 86.

could not afford to interfere with their high-handed exploitation. It would appear that the overlords were aware of the heavy taxes imposed by the chiefs and gave them some degree of approval by recognising their existence. In the land-grants of the period we sometimes find the terms niyatāniyata[1], ucitānucita[2] and bhaviṣyat[3] suffixed to the lists of taxes which a donor king transferred to the grantee. These terms amount to a recognition of the possibility of new taxes being imposed in the future, and of their being unjust in some cases. The legal opinion also would appear to have been modified a little to suit the new conditions and thus to provide some sanction for the feudal exactions. Thus we find Medhātithi[4] observing that the vaiśyas are very wealthy and hence the officers appointed to extract money from them are not to be punished even if they do them wrong.

As we have already shown[5], the feudal chiefs indulged in loot and plunder, thus creating difficulties for the merchants carrying on inter-state trade.

The frequent feudal wars of the period were also responsible

---

1. E.I., X p. 99.
2. J.U.P.H.S., XXIII.228-50.
3. J.B.O.R.S., XVII.1ff 11.37-49.
4. On Manu X.119 - Vaiśyā mahādhanā bhavanti. Tatastathāharaṇe niyuktāḥ kṛtāparādhā na hanyante.
5. See supra pp. 171-72.

for much destruction of the economic prosperity of the country. The records of the period indicate that the invaders often attempted to cripple the economy of their enemy and to destroy the lives and property of their subjects. Thus Medhātithi[1] advises a king to invade the enemy territory during the months of Phālguna and Caitra because thus he can injure the other party by destroying standing crops. Likewise in the case of a siege the same authority recommends that the invading king should harass the territories outside the fortress occupied by the enemy by kidnapping the inhabitants and persecuting them in various ways.[2] The Mānasollāsa[3] speaks of the destructions which a king could inflict on his enemy. He could cut down the forests, destroy the water-reservoirs and burn the villages (deśanāśaka), or capture by force all the cattle (gograha), or snatch all the grain whether stored in granaries, markets or threshing-floors or still in the fields, and thus cause famine (dhānyaharaṇa); he might capture and imprison the householders, cultivators and rich bankers and merchants (bandigrāha), or encircle the villages with soldiers and forcefully take the inhabitants' gold (dhanādāna); if he had a large army he might

---

1. On Manu VII.182.
2. Ibid. 195.
3. I pp. 122f vv. 1038-47.

besiege cities and take everything (sarvasva-haraṇa). It is claimed in an epigraphic record of the period that in the battle of Rohaḍavāpika (Rohaḍavāpikottha-aamare) the subjects (prajā) of a certain ruler named Maṇḍalika struck with spearheads by the Cāhamāna king Pṛthvipāla's troopers left far away their shame, sons, wives, mothers as well as property, and fled away in all directions.[1] We learn from the Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] that during the reign of Sussala the ḍāmaras set fire to a temple in which many people of the neighbourhood had sought asylum with their women, children, animals, rich stores and property. It would follow from a reference in the Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita[3] that it was very common in this period for kings to destroy each others' village-lands.

The sacking of cities seems to have been a common feature of the wars of this period.[4] Ānanda, the governor of Kramarājya, advised king Uccala to proceed to Śrīnagara and plunder the neighbouring towns and villages.[5] In the Rājataraṅgiṇī[6] we read on many occasions of cities and villages being burnt and

---

1. D.Sharma, Early Chauhān Dynasties, pp. 188ff at p. 190 ll.17-18.
2. VIII.971-1004.
3. Vol. I p.198.
4. Cf. Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā, p. 629. See also B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, p. 245.
5. Rāj., VII.1323-5.
6. VII.1325; VIII.734, 1127, 1169-85.

pillaged by rebels. We can easily imagine the nature and amount of ruin and economic dislocation resulting from these wars. We have already referred to a passage from the Mānasollāsa[1] which speaks of an invading king as confiscating all the grain in the kingdom of the enemy with the result that famine visited the invaded country. The Rājataraṅgiṇī[2] gives a vivid description of the ruin brought about by the sack of Śrīnagara. The entire city was reduced to a heap of earth, full of swollen decomposing corpses. The ground was white with fragments of human skulls. The granaries were consumed by fire. The famishing people, scarcely able to walk, appeared like scorched wooden posts.

These feudal wars must have meant a tremendous strain for both the parties and must have dislocated the economic and cultural life of the vanquished country. People could not pursue their normal callings for some time because of the resulting chaos. Medhātithi[3], therefore, advises the conqueror to consolidate his power over the conquered territory and to proclaim that henceforward every one among the people was free to

---

1. I p. 122, vv. 1041-42.
2. VIII.1184-1212.
3. On Manu VII.201 - yathāsvaṃ svaṃ svyāpāram anutiṣṭhantu.

take to his own calling. When Pālī was captured and sacked by the Caulukya king Kumārapāla in V.S. 1207, a Jain monk named Sthiracandragaṇi, who was copying a text at the time, had to flee to Ajmer where he completed the work.[1] As we have pointed out earlier trade and commerce in particular suffered much from existing feudal anarchy.[2]

Whatever might have been the ideal, it appears that the march of the army often brought destruction to the people living in the villages through which it passed, and thus the subjects suffered at the hands of the army of their own ruler.[3] It would follow from the works of Bāṇa that even in the time of Harṣa the marching armies meant considerable damage to the crops and much physical labour and strain to the villagers.[4] The Tilaka-mañjarī[5], which belongs to the period under study, also vividly describes the destructions which an army inflicted on a village which was situated on the path of its march. The soldiers carried away all the chaff from the threshing-floors, and robbed the villagers of their valuables and their fodder;

---

1. Catalogue of MSS in the Jaisalmer Bhandars, p. 7.
2. See supra pp. 170-73.
3. According to Aparārka on Yāj., II.163 (A.S.S., p.771) the horses and elephants belonging to the king are simply to be warded off and no redress is possible for the harm caused by them to the crop.
4. Cf. V.S.Agrawala, Kādambarī, pp. 125f and Harṣacarita, p.201.
5. pp. 119f.

elephant riders sometimes directed their elephants against villagers who took to flight; vegetable gardens and sugarcane plantations were looted; some peasants were forcibly turned out by thakkuras, who could not get accommodation, and with their possessions in their hands went from house to house in search of shelter. The peasants did their best to conceal their corn, and even their dried cowdung was not safe from looting; the poorer peasants hid their valuables in the houses of their wealthier neighbours where they were better protected.

This darker aspect of the economic life of the times, especially the disastrous effects of the feudal polity, is often neglected in the studies of the subject.[1] This gives a wrong notion of the stages in the economic life of the country.

The common belief among Indians is that the present poverty of India is the result of economic exploitation during two hundred years of British rule. We do not aim at challenging the truism that much of India's wealth and her raw-materials were drained by the British rule. But a study of the economic history of India suggests that it would be wrong to blame the British alone for the economic backwardness of India. The question must be judged in its true historical perspective. We

---

1. Cf. Chapters on Economic Life in the Age of Imperial Kanauj and the Struggle for Empire.

find that the economic decline of India has a history spreading over many centuries. Our present analysis has shown that the feudal polity in the early medieval period affected the economic prosperity of the country adversely and reduced the cultivators to a low state of subsistence. India still remained prosperous; but the prosperity was monopolised by the rulers, including the feudal chiefs, the merchants and the temples. The common villager of our period was often in a miserable condition.

The effects of the Muslim invasions and of Muslim rule in general is often not realised in a study of this question.[1] As the question is outside the chronological scope of our study we discuss only some important aspects of it.

The early Muslim invasions of Muḥammad bin Qāsim, the Ghaznavids and the Ghūrids drained India of much wealth. If we make a list of all the recorded amounts ~~xxx~~ obtained during these invasions as spoil, ransom or tribute, it will reach a fabulous sum. As contrasted with later periods when the Muslims had established themselves in India all these amounts were taken to countries beyond the frontiers of India.

As almost all the sources which pertain to the early Muslim rule are Muslim in origin, it is difficult to get a

---

1. Cf. R.C.Majumdar in the Age of Delhi Sultanate, p. 623 for a comparative estimate of the Muslim rule and British rule.

correct picture of those times. Sometimes in order to laud the victorious arms of Islam, these narratives present an exaggerated picture. Even then we can form some idea of the enormous economic loss and ruin and the dislocation of economic life which the Muslim invasions meant. Thus Al-Bīrūnī says that "Mahmūd utterly ruined the prosperity of the country, and performed there wonderful exploits, by which the Hindus became like atoms of dust scattered in all directions, and like a tale of old in the mouth of the people"[1]. The chronicles dealing with the early Muslim invasions are full of references, too many to list, to destruction and ravage.[2]

As in the case of earlier invasions Indian literature does not take any detailed notice of the foreign invasion[3] and so we cannot describe the destruction and ruin which the people had to f suffer nor can we check up the Muslim narratives. But we do get some incidental references which indicate that the invaders inflicted heavy losses on the people. The Ādipurāṇa[4]

---

1. I.22.
2. Cf. The Struggle for Empire, pp. 499f. See e.g., Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī - Bakhtyār Khaljī conquered the fort of Bihar, plundered and ravaged the whole of the country, and acquired much booty - (B.I., p.50). The recent excavations at Lal-Kot, Delhi reveal a deposit of burnt ash and earth mixed with the debris of fallen structures-Indian Archaeology, 1957-58, p.25.
3. Cf. Medhātithi on Manu II.22-Āryāvarta was so called because them Āryas sprang up in it again and again. Even if it was overrun by the Mlecchas, they could never abide there for lon
4. XIV.139f-Asurā yavanāmśeṣu jātā lokopatāpinaḥ.
   Anītiniratāḥ sarve saṃgrahe ca prabuddhayaḥ.
   Palāyamānāsteṣāṃ hi prajāḥ syurapi pīditāḥ.
   Prāpurdeśāntaraṃ cāpi kvacinna sukhitābhavan.

describes the oppression of the people at the hands of Asuras who are said to have been born out of Yavanas. The description would suggest that the author of the text knew of the tyranny of the Muslims. It says that these people will be addicted to immoral ways, will oppress the people and will snatch and collect all the wealth and that many people will flee to other lands. The Kāhnaḍade Prabandha of Padmanābha (c. A.D. 1456) describes the destructive effects of the armies of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī and we can safely utilise it to indicate the nature of ruin spread by the earlier invading armies of Muslims. The text says that "the conquering army burnt villages; devastated the land, plundered people's wealth, took brāhmaṇas, children and women of all castes captive, and flogged them with thongs and raw hide, carried a moving prison with it, and converted the prisoners into obsequious Turks"[1]. The popular impression about the devastation which accompanied Muslim invasions is reflected best in a document of the Lekhapaddhati[2], which speaks of a rājaputra girl, who left her village, when, as a result of the plunder by the invading Muslims, famine visited the place; and , as the families of her parents and in-laws were now reduced to beggary,

---

1. q. by K.M.Munshi in his Foreword to The Struggle for Empire, pp. xiv-xv.
2. pp. 45-7.

in order to keep alive she wandered from village to village until at last she had to accept slavery on most depressing terms.

Even after establishing themselves as rulers the Muslims did not change their policy basically. They aimed at oppressing the subjects and extracting money from them for their luxuries. The only difference which we notice was that now not much of the loot and plunder went beyond the frontiers of India but was enjoyed by the ruling class in India. We have referred above to the devastations which accompanied the invasions made by 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī. The Muslim rulers did not care much about the prosperity of the people; they were content merely to extort money for themselves and sometimes did not bother much about local administration. On the contraty, we definitely know at least in the case of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī that he deliberately wanted to reduce the Hindus of Doab to such a state of abject poverty that they might devote all their time and energy merely to feeding themselves.[1] Even if we allow for the element of exaggeration, we can realise the amount of destruction from the description of Hindusthan as given by Amīr Khusrav, a liberal Muslim. He says "The whole country, by means of the sword of our holy warriors, has become like a forest denuded

---

1. An Advanced History of India, p. 308.

of its thorns by fire....The strongmen of Hind have been trodden under foot, and all are ready to pay tribute....Had not the law granted exemption from death by the payment of poll-tax, the very name of Hind, root and branch, would have been extinguished"[1].

There is some evidence to suggest that even after the establishment of Muslim rule those parts which did not come under their dominance continued to enjoy a fair degree of prosperity, compared with which the areas ruled by Muslims were economically not well off. In this connection we have to notice that the richest architectural remains of our period belong to northern India or to those parts of north, such as Orissa and Central India, which were not much affected by Muslim invasion. Though we have to allow due margin to the iconoclastic fury of the Muslims, it is not without significance that we do not get any indication that any Hindu monument worth its name was constructed in the areas conquered by Muslims.[2] The Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī of Shams-i-Sirāj gives a glowing picture of the prosperity and happiness of the country of Jājnagar (Orissa) before it was invaded by Fīrūz Shāh in 1360; "the inhabitants had spacious houses and fine gardens, they had even gardens and walks within

---

1. Elliot and Dowson, III p. 546.
2. The recent excavations at Nevasa (Ahmadnagar) indicate that the medieval period which saw the establishment of Muslim rule was one of decline in the prosperity of Nevasa - Indian Archaeology, 1955-56, p. 11.

their houses, and fruit trees, flowers, etc., were cultivated therein".[1] The way in which the amazed writer describes the prosperity of Orissa implies by way of contrast that such a state of prosperity was not known in those parts of northern India which were under Muslim occupation. The known history of the period does not show any economic advantage possessed by Orissa over other parts of northern India to explain its prosperity. On the contrary the general impression is that it was one of the areas which formed economic backwaters in the period. The only possible difference which we can notice is that it had so far been free from Muslim invasions and depredations. To bring home the point we must refer to the testimony of the Russian traveller Afanasiĭ Nikitiṅ, who was in India from 1469 to 1472 and whose journal is regarded by competent scholars as a reliable source.[2] His account reveals a grim contrast between the selfish pomp and luxury of the Sultān and his nobility, and the extreme poverty of the common people.[3] Nikitin is the first foreign visitor to India to refer to its poverty. It would therefore appear that though the economic exploitation of the country took place on a large and systematic manner later on, India had become poor after the establishment of the Muslim power.

---

1. 9. in D.H.N.I., I pp. 491f.
2. J.A.O.S., Vol. 81, p. 128.
3. R.H.Major, India in the fifteenth century, p. 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Texts in Indian Languages and Translations

Abhidhānacintāmaṇi of Hemacandra in the Abhidhānasaṁgraha, Vol. II. N.S.P. Bombay, Śaka 1818.

Abhidhānarājendra of Vijayarājendra. Ed. Muni Dīpa vijaya. 7 Vols. Ratlam, 1913-25.

Abhidhānaratnamālā of Halāyudha (Halāyudhakośa). Ed. Jayaśaṅkara Jośī. Varanasi, Śaka 1879.

Ādipurāṇa of Jinasena I in Mahāpurāṇa. Syādvāda-Granthamālā. Indore, Vikrama 1973-5.

Agni Purāṇa. A.S.S. Poona, 1900. Tr. M.N.Dutt. Calcutta, 1903.

Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Ed. T.Aufrecht. Bonn, 1879. Tr. A.B.Keith. Cambridge, 1920.

Amarakoṣa with Kṣīrasvāmin's commentary. Ed. K.G.Oak. Poona, 1913.

Apabhraṃśa-Kāvyatrayī of Jinadattasūri. Ed. L.B.Gandhi. Baroda, 1927.

Āpastamba Dharmasūtra. Ed. G.Bühler. Bombay, 1892, 1894.

Aparājitapṛcchā of Bhuvanadeva. Ed. P.A.Mankad. Baroda, 1950.

Aparārka's commentary on Yājñavalkyasmṛti. A.S.S. 2 Vols. Poona, 1903, 1904.

Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya. Ed. R.Shamasastry. Mysore, 1919. Ed. T.Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1924-25. Tr. R.Shamasastry. Mysore, 1929.

Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa. Ed. T.Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1920.

Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya of Vāgbhaṭa. Ed. A.M.Kunte. Bombay, 1880.

Aucityavicāracarcā of Kṣemendra. Ed. Dhuṇḍhirājaśāstrin. Banaras, 1933.

Bauddha Gān O' Dohā. Ed. H.P.Sastri. Calcutta, B.S. 1323.

Bhaṭṭadīpikā on Pūrvamīmāṃsā-darśana by Khaṇḍadeva. Ed. Madhava Sastri and L.Srinivasacarya. Mysore, 1911.

Bhaṭṭasvāmin's commentary on Arthaśāstra. J.B.O.R.S., XII.

Bhaṭṭotpala's commentary on Bṛhatsaṃhitā of Varāhamihira. Ed. Sudhakara Dvivedi. Banaras, 1895, 1897.

Bhavisayattakahā of Dhanapāla. Ed. C.D.Dalal and P.D.Gune. Baroda, 1923.

Bījagaṇita of Bhāskarācārya. Ed. Achyutananda Jha. Banaras, 1949.

Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā of Kṣemendra. B.I. 2 Vols. Calcutta 1888ff.

Bṛhannāradīya Purāṇa. Ed. P.H.Sastri. Calcutta, 1891.

Bṛhatkathākośa of Hariṣeṇa. Ed. A.N.Upadhye. Bombay, 1943.

Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra. Ed. Sivadatta and Parab. N.S.P. Bombay, 1931.

Bṛhatkathāślokasaṅgraha of Budhasvāmin. Ed. with Fr. translation. F.Lacôte. 28 Vols. Paris, 1908-1929.

Bṛhat-Parāśara in Dharmaśāstra-saṅgraha. Ed. Jīvananda Vidyāsāgara Bhattacharya. Calcutta, 1876.

Caryāgītikoṣa. Ed. P.C.Bagchi and S.B.Sastri. Santiniketan, 1956.

Caturbhāṇi (comprising Padmaprābhṛtaka of Śūdraka, Dhūrtaviṭasaṃvāda of Īśvaradatta, Ubhayābhisārikā of Vararuci and Pādatāḍitaka of Śyāmilaka). Ed. Ramkrishna Kavi and S.K.Ramanatha Sastri. Patna, 1922.

Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri. Ed. Bharatachandra Siromani. B.I. Calcutta, 1873-1911.

Daśakumāracarita of Daṇḍin. Ed. M.R.Kale. Bombay, 1917. Tr. W.Ryder. Chicago, 1927.

Daśavaikālikasūtra. Devchand Lāl-bhāī Jaina-pustakoddhāra Series No.47. Bombay, 1918.

Dāyabhāga of Jīmūtavāhana (with the commentary of Kṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra). Calcutta, 1829. Tr. H.T.Colebrooke. Calcutta, 1910.

Deśīnāmamālā of Hemacandra. Ed. R.Pischel. 2nd edition by P.V. Ramanujaswami. Vizianagaram, 1938.

Deśopadeśa of Kṣemendra. Ed. M.Kaul. Poona, 1923.

Dharmasindhusāra of Kāśīnāthopādhyāya. Ed. Y.G.Dikshita. Poona,

1911.

Dhūrtākhyāna of Haribhadra Sūri. Ed. A.N.Upadhye and Jina Vijaya Muni. Bombay, 1944.

Dhūrtaviṭasaṃvāda. See Caturbhāṇi.

Dohākośa of Sarahapāda. Ed. R.Sāṃkṛtyāyana. Patna, 1958.

Dvyāśrayakāvya of Hemacandra. Ed. A.V.Kathvate. 2 Vols. Bombay, 1915, 1921.

Gaṇitasārasaṅgraha of Mahāviracarya. Ed. M.Rangacarya. Madras, 1912.

Garuḍa Purāṇa. Tr. M.N.Dutt. Calcutta, 1908.

Gautama Dharmasūtra. Ed. A.F.Stenzler. London, 1876.

Gṛhastharatnākara of Caṇḍeśvara. Calcutta, 1928.

Harṣacarita of Bāṇa. Ed. J.Vidyāsāgara. Calcutta, 1892.

Hindī Kāvya Dhārā. Ed. R.Sāṃkṛtyāyana. Allahabad, 1945.

Jagaḍucarita of Sarvānanda. G.Bühler : Indian Studies No.1.

Jambūdvīpaprajñapti. Devchand Lāl-bhāī Jaina-pustakoddhāra Series Nos. 52, 54. Bombay, 1920.

Jātakas. Ed. V.Fausboll. London, 1877-97. Tr. E.B.Cowell. Cambridge, 1895-1913.

Jñāneśvarī. Ed. R.V.Madganvakar. Bombay, 1907.

Kalāvilāsa of Kṣemendra in Kāvyamālā I.34ff. N.S.P. Bombay.

Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana. Ed. Durga Prasad. Bombay, 1900. Tr. H.Kern. J.R.A.S., 1870-75.

Karpūramañjarī of Rājaśekhara. Ed. Rāmakumāra Ācārya. Banaras,

1955.

Kathākoṣa. Tr. C.H.Tawney. London, 1895.

Kathākośaprakaraṇa of Jineśvara Sūri. Ed. Jina Vijaya Muni. Bombay, 1949.

Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadeva. Ed. Durga Prasad and Parab. N.S.P. Bombay, 1930.

Kātyāyana-Smṛti-Sāroddhāra. Ed. P.V.Kane. Bombay, 1933.

Kavikaṇṭhābharaṇa of Kṣemendra. Ed. Dhuṇḍhirājaśāstrin. Banaras, 1933.

Kavīndravacanasamuccaya. Ed. F.W.Thomas. Calcutta, 1912.

Kāvyamīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara. Ed. C.D.Dalal and R.A.Sastry. Rev. by K.S.Ramaswami Sastri Siromani. Baroda, 1934.

Kṛṣi-Parāśara. Ed. G.P.Majumdar a nd S.C.Banerji. B.I. Calcutta, 1960.

Kṛtyakalpataru of Lakṣmīdhara. Ed. K.V.R.Aiyangar. Baroda.

Brahmacāri. 1948.

Dāna. 1941.

Gṛhastha. 1944.

Rājadharma. 1943.

Vyavahāra. 1953.

Kullūka's commentary on the Manusmṛti. See Manusmṛti.

Kumārasambhava of Kālidāsa. Bombay, 1927. Tr. R. T.H.Griffith. London, 1879.

Kuṭṭanīmata of Dāmodara. Ed. M.Kaul. Calcutta, 1944. Tr. E. Powys Mathers. London, 1927.

Kuvalayamālākathā. See Apabhraṃśa-kāvya-trayī.

Laṭakamelaka of Śaṅkhadhara. Ed. Durga Prasad and Parab. N.S.P. Bombay, 1923.

Lekhapaddhati. Ed. C.D.Dalal and G.K.Shrigondekar. Baroda, 1925.

Līlāvatī of Bhāskarācārya (Colebrooke's translation of the Līlāvatī). Ed. H.C.Banerji. Calcutta, 1893.

Lokaprakāśa of Kṣemendra. Ed. J.D.Zadoo. Srinagar, 1947. Fr. Tr. J.Bloch. Paris, 1914.

Mahābhārata. Ed. with the commentary of Nīlakaṇṭha by R.Kinjawadekar. Poona, 1929-33. Also Critical edition, Poona.

Mānasollāsa of king Someśvara. Ed. G.K.Shrigondekar. 2 Vols. Baroda, 1925, 1930.

Manusmṛti with the Manubhāṣya of Medhātithi. Ed. G.Jha. Calcutta, 1932-39. Tr. G.Jha. Calcutta, 1922-29. Ed. with the commentary of Kullūka (Manvarthamuktāvali). Ed. N.R. Acharya. Bombay, 1946.

Medhātithi's commentary on Manu. See Manusmṛti.

Medinīkośa of Medinīkara. Calcutta, 1884.

Mīmāṃsāsūtra of Jaimini with Śabarasvāmin's commentary. Ed. M. Vidyaratna. Calcutta, 1873. Tr. G.Jha. Allahabad, 1910. Tr. of Śabarabhāṣya by G.Jha. Baroda, 1933-36.

Mitākṣarā (commentary by Vijñāneśvara) on Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ed. J.R.Gharpure. Bombay, 1914. Tr. J.R.Gharpure. Bombay, 1936ff.

Moharājaparājaya of Yaśaḥpāla. Ed. Muni Chaturvijaya. Baroda, 1918.

Mṛcchakaṭika of Śūdraka. Ed. R.D.Karmarkar. Poona, 1950.

Naiṣadhīyacarita of Śrī-Harṣa. N. S.P. Bombay, 1933. Tr. K.K. Handiqui. Lahore, 1934.

Nāmamālikā of Bhoja. Ed. E.K.Kulkarni and V.D.Gokhale. Poona, 1955.

Nāradasmṛti. Ed. J.Jolly. Calcutta, 1885. Tr. J.Jolly. Oxford, 1889.

Narmamālā of Kṣemendra. Ed. M.Kaul. Poona, 1923.

Nāyādhammakahā. Agamodayasamiti Mehesana Bombay, 1919.

Nyāyamālāvistara. A.S.S. 1892.

Padmānandamahākāvya of Abhayacandra Sūri. Ed. H.R.Kapadia. Baroda, 1932.

Parāśaramādhavīya. Ed. M.Chandrakanta Tarkalankara. Calcutta, 1890-99.

Prabandhacintāmaṇi of Merutuṅga. Ed. Jinavijaya Muni. Santiniketana, 1933. Tr. C.H.Tawney. Calcutta, 1901.

Prākṛit Vyākaraṇa of Hemacandra (along with the Kumārapālacarita). Ed. P.L.Vaidya. Bombay, 1936.

Rājanītiratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara. Ed. K.P.Jayaswal. Patna, 1936.

Rājataraṅgiṇī of Kalhaṇa. Ed. M.A.Stein. Bombay, 1892. Tr. M.A.Stein. Westminster, 1900.

Rāmacarita of Sandhyākara Nandī. Ed. R.C.Majumdar, R.G.Basak and N.G.Banerji. Rajshahi, 1939.

Ratirahasya of Kokkoka. Ed. Sadananda Sastrin Ghildiyal. Lahore, 1923.

Saduktikarṇāmṛta of Śrīdharadāsa. Ed. R.Sharma. Lahore, 1933.

Samarāiccakahā of Haribhadra Sūri. Bombay, 1938. Chs. I-II. Ed. M.C.Modi. Ahmedabad, 1935. Ch. VI. Ed. M.C.Modi. Ahmedabad, 1936.

Samarāṅgaṇasūtradhāra of Bhoja. Ed. T.Ganapati Sastri. Baroda, 1925.

Samayamātṛkā of Kṣemendra. Ed. Durga Prasad and K.P.Parab. Bombay, 1925. Tr. E.Powys Mathers. London, 1927.

Sandeśarāsaka of Abdula Raḥmāna. Ed. H.Bhayani. Bombay, 1945.

Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī of Vācaspatimiśra. Ed. G.Jha. Calcutta, 1896.

Sarasvatīvilāsa of Pratāparudra. Mysore, 1927.

Śārṅgadharapaddhati. Ed. P.Peterson. Vol. I. Bombay, 1888.

Śatakatrayādisubhāṣitasaṅgraha. Ed. D.D.Kosambi. Bombay, 1949.

Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. Ed. A.Weber. London, 1885. Tr. J.Eggeling. Oxford, 1882-1900.

Smṛticandrikā of Devaṇṇabhaṭa (Bibliotheca Sanskrita No.45). Ed. L.Srinivasacharya. 6 Vols. Mysore, 1914-21. Ed. J.R. Gharpure. Bombay, 1918.

Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa of Vidyākara. Ed. D.D.Kosambi and V.V.Gokhale. Harvard, 1957.

Śukranīti. Ed. G.Oppert. Madras, 1882. Tr. B.K.Sarkar. Allahabad, 1914.

Sūktimuktāvali of Jalhaṇa. Ed. E.Krishnamacharya. Baroda, 1938.

Suvṛttatilaka of Kṣemendra. Ed. Dhuṇḍirājaśāstrin. Banaras, 1933.

Tilakamañjarīkathā of Dhanapāla. N.S.P. Bombay, 1903.

Trikāṇḍaśeṣa of Puruṣottama. Ed. C.A.Seelakkhandha. Bombay, 1916.

Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita of Hemacandra. Prasarakasabha, Bhavnagar. 6 Vols. 1905-9. Tr. H.M.Johnson. 4 Vols. Baroda, 1931, 1937, 1949, 1954.

Udayasundarīkathā of Soḍḍhala. Ed. C.D.Dalal and E.Krishnamacharya. Baroda, 1920.

Uktivyaktiprakaraṇa of Dāmodara Paṇḍita. Ed. Jina Vijaya Muni. Bombay, 1953.

Upamitibhavaprapañcākathā of Siddharṣi. Ed. P.Peterson. Calcutta, 1899.

Vaijayantī of Yādavaprakāśa. Ed. G.Oppert. Madras, 1893.

Vāmana Purāṇa. Calcutta, 1885.

Vastupālacarita of Jinaharṣaganī. Jamnagara Bhaskarodaya Press.

Viddhaśālabhañjikā of Rājaśekhara. Ed. J.B.Chaudhuri. Calcutta, 1943.

Vikramāṅkadevacarita of Bilhaṇa. Ed. G.Buhler. Bombay, 1875.

Vīramitrodaya of Mitramiśra. Chowkhamba Edn. Banaras. Ed. J. Vidyasagar. Calcutta, 1875. Vyavahāraprakāśa. Calcutta, 1875.

Viṣṇu Dharmasūtra. Ed. J.Jolly. Calcutta, 1881. Tr. J.Jolly. Oxford, 1880.

Viśvarūpa's commentary (Bālakrīḍā) on Yājñavalkyasmṛti. T.Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1922-24.

Vivādaratnākara of Caṇḍeśvara. Ed. J.Vidyasagara. Calcutta, 1887.

Vyavahāramayūkha of Bhaṭṭa Nīlakaṇṭha. Ed. P.V.Kane. Bombay, 1926.

Vyavahāranirṇaya of Varadarāja. Ed. K.V.R.Aiyangar and A.N.K. Aiyangar. Adyar, 1942.

Vyavahāraprakāśa. See Vīramitrodaya.

Yājñavalkyasmṛti. Ed. T.Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1922-24.

Yuktikalpataru of Bhoja. Ed. Isvara Candra Sastri. Calcutta, 1917.

B. FOREIGN ACCOUNTS.

Beal,S. - Life of Hiuen Tsang by the Shaman Hwui-li. London, 1911.

Beveridge,A.S. - Bābur-Nāma (Memoirs of Babur). 2 Vols. London, 1921.

Briggs,J. - Tārikh-i-Firishta of Muhammad Qāsim Firishta. 4 Vols. London, 1827-29.

De,B. - Tabaqāt-i-Akbarī of Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad. 3 Vols. Calcutta, 1913-40.

Defremery,C. and Sanguinetti,B.R. - Voyages d' Ibn Batoutah. 4 Vols. Paris, 1853-1914.

Elliot,H.M. and Dowson, J. - History of India as told by its own historians. 8 Vols. London, 1866-77. Vol. II Reprinted with Introduction by M.Habib, Commentary by S.H.Hodivala, and Supplement by K.A.Nizami. Aligarh, 1952.

Ferrand,G. - Relations des Voyages et Textes Géographiques Arabes, Persans et Turks - Relatifs a l' Extrême-Orient du VIII^{e} au XVIII^{e} siècles. 2 Vols. Paris, 1913-14.

Ferrand,G. - Voyage du Marchand Arabe Sulaymān en Inde et en Chine. Paris, 1922.

Gibb,H.A.R. - Ibn Battuta. Travels in Asia and Africa. London, 1929.

Hirth,F. and Rockhill,W.W. - Chau Ju-kua. St. Petersburg, 1911.

Legge,J.H. - Record of the Buddhist ~~Religion as practised in~~ Kingdoms, being an account of the Chinese monk Fahien's Travels, ~~India and the Malaya Archipelago by I-Tsing.~~ Oxford, 1896.

Major,R.H. - India in the Fifteenth Century. Hakluyt Society Series I No. 22. London, 1857.

McCrindle,J.W. - Ancient India as described in Classical literature. West Minister, 1901.

McCrindle,J.W. - Ancient India as described by Ptolemy. Calcutta, 1825.

McCrindle,J.W. - Christian Topography by Cosmas. London, 1897.

Minorsky,V. - Ḥudūd al-'Ālam. London, 1937.

Pigeud,Theodore G.Th. - Java in the 14th century (The Nāgara Kĕrtāgama) by Rakawi Prapañca of Majapahit. 3 Vols. The Hague, 1960.

Raverty,H.G. - Tabaqāt-i-Nāsirī of Minhaj-ud-dīn b. Sirāj-ud-din. Calcutta, 1873-97.

Renaudot,E. - Ancient accounts of India and China by two Mohammeden travellers. London, 1733.

Sachau,E.C. - Alberuni's India. 2 Vols. London, 1888.

Schoff,W.H. - The Periplusa of the Erythraean Sea. London, 1912.

Takakusu,J.A. - Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malaya Archipelago by I-Tsing. Oxford, 1896.

Watters,T. Ed. Rhys Davids,T.W. and Bushell,I.W. - On Yuan Chwang's travels in India. 2 Vols. London, 1904-5.

Yule,H. - The Book of Ser Marco Polo. 2 Vols. London, 1875. Also Tr. Ricci,A. Ed. Ross,D. 1931.

Yule, H. and Cordier,H. - Cathay and the Way Thither. 4 Vols. London, 1915-16.

C. Inscriptions and Coins.

Bhattacharya,P.N. - Kāmarūpa-śāsanāvalī. Rangpur, 1338 B.S.

Bhandarkar, D.R. - Carmichael Lectures on Ancient Indian Numismatics. Calcutta, 1921.

Bhandarkar,D.R. - List of Inscriptions of Northern India. Appendix to E.I., XIX-XXIII.

Bidyabinod,B.B. - Supplementary Catalogue of the coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. Non-Muhammadan Series. Vol. I. Calcutta, 1923.

Brown, C.J. - Coins of India. Calcutta, 1922.

Cunningham, A. - Coins of Mediaeval India from the seventh century down to the Muhammadan conquest. London, 1894.

Durgaprasad, Śivadatta and Parab,K.P. - Prācīnalekhamālā. 3 Vols Kāvyamālā nos. 34, 64, 80. Bombay, 1892, 1897, 1903.

Elliot, W. - Coins of Southern India. London, 1896.

Fleet,J.F. - Gupta Inscriptions. C.I.I., Vol. III. Calcutta, 1888.

Gadre,A.S. - Important inscriptions from the Baroda State. Vol. I. Baroda, 1943.

Hultzsch, E. - South Indian Inscriptions. 3 Vols. Archaeological Survey of India. New Imperial Series, Vols. 9, 10 and 29. Madras, 1890-1929.

Majumdar,N.G. - Inscriptions of Bengal. Vol. III. Rajshahi, 1929.

Mirashi,V.V. - Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era. C.I.I., Vol. IV. Ootacamund, 1955.

Nahar,P.C. - Jaina Inscriptions (Jaina-lekha-saṅgraha) . 3 Vols. Calcutta, 1918-1929.

Peterson,P. - A collection of Prakrit and Sanskrit inscriptions. Bhavnagar Archaeological Department. Bhavnagar, 1905.

Rapson,E.J. - Catalogue of the coins of the Andhra Dynasty, the Western Kṣatrapas, the Traikūṭaka Dynasty and the Bodhi Dynasty. London, 1908.

Sircar,D.C. - Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian history and civilization. Vol. I. Calcutta, 1942.

Smith, V.A. - Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta, including the cabinet of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. I. Oxford, 1906.

Vogel,J.Ph. - Antiquities of the Chamba State. Calcutta, 1911.

D. Secondary Sources.

Agrawal,V.S. - Harṣacarita : eka Sāṃskṛtika Adhyayana. Patna, 1953.

Agrawal,V.S. - Kādambarī : eka Sāṃskṛtika Adhyayana. Banaras, 1957.

Altekar,A.S. - Rāshṭrakūṭas and their times. Poona, 1934.

Altekar,A.S. - State and government in ancientt India. Delhi, 1958.

Badger,G.P. - A History of the Immams and Sayyids of Oman. London, 1871.

Bagchi,P.C. - India and China. Calcutta, 1944.

Bandyopadhyaya,N.C. - Kauṭilya, or an Exposition of his social ideas and political theory. Vol. I. Calcutta, 1927.

J. N. Banerjea Volume. Calcutta, 1960.

Barua,B.K. - A Cultural History of Assam (early period). Vol. I. Nowgong, 1951.

Basham,A.L. - History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas. London, 1951.

Basham,A.L. - The Wonder that was India. London, 1954.

Bose,N.S. - History of the Candellas. Calcutta, 1956.

Chavannes,E. - Mémoire Composé á l' époque de la grande dynastie T'ang sur les Religieux Eminents qui allerent chercher á' loi dans les pays d' Occident, par I-tsing. Paris, 1894.

Chi, Tsui - A Short history of Chinese civilisation. London, 1942.

Choudhury,P.C. - The history of the civilisation of the people of Assam to the twelfth century A.D. Gauhati, 1959.

Çoedès,G. - Histoire Ancienne des États Hindoisés d' Extrême-Orient. Hanoi, 1944.

Codrington, K.De B. - An Introduction to the study of Mediaeval Indian Sculpture. London, 1929.

Dange,S.A. - India from Primitive Communism to Slavery. Bombay, 1949.

Das, S.K. - Economic History of Ancient India. Calcutta, 1925.

Dasgupta,T.C. - Aspects of Bengali Society. Calcutta, 1935.

Duyvendak,J.J.L. - China's Discovery of Africa. London, 1949.

Forbes,A.K. - Rās Mālā. Ed. H.G.Rawlinson. London, 1878.

Ganguly,D.C. - History of the Paramāra Dynasty. Dacca, 1933.

Ghoshal,U.N. - The Agrarian System in Ancient India. Calcutta, 1930.

Ghoshal,U.N. - The Beginnings of Indian Historiography and other essays. Calcutta, 1944.

Ghoshal,U.N. - Contributions to the History of the Hindu Revenue System. Calcutta, 1929.

Ghoshal,U.N. - A History of Indian Political Ideas. Oxford, 1959.

Ghoshal,U.N. - Studies in Indian History and Culture. Calcutta, 1957.

Gode,P.K. - Studies in Indian Literary History. Vol. III. Bombay, 1953.

Gupta,K.M. - The Land System in South India between c. 800 A.D. and 1200 A.D. Lahore, 1933.

Hasan,H. - A History of Persian Navigation. London, 1928.

Hazra,R.C. - Studies in the Upapurāṇas. Vol. I. Calcutta, 1958.

Hirth,F. - China and the Roman Orient. Leipsic. 1885.

Hourani,G.F.- Arab seafaring in the Indian Ocean in ancient and early medieval times. Princeton, 1951.

Jolly,J. - Hindū Law and Custom. Tr. B.K.Ghosh. Calcutta, 1928.

Kane,P.V. - History of Dharmaśāstra. Vols. II- IV. Poona, 1941, 1946, 1953.

Kosambi,D.D. - An Introduction to the Study of Indian history. Bombay, 1956.

Latourette,K.S. - The Chinese : their history and culture. New York, 1946.

Lévi,S. - Le Nepal. 3 Vols. Paris, 1905.

Maitland,F.W. - The Constitutional History of England. Cambridge, 1931.

Maity,S.K. - Economic Life of northern India in the Gupta period: cir. A.D. 300-550. Calcutta, 1957.

Majumdar,A.K. - Chaulukyas of Gujarat. Bombay, 1956.

Majumdar,R.C. - Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East. Vol.I : Champa. Lahore, 1927. Vol.II : Suvarṇadvīpa Parts 1 and 2. Dacca, 1937, 1938.

Majumdar,R.C. - Hindu Colonies in the Far East. Calcutta, 1944.

Majumdar,R.C. - The History of Bengal. Vol. I. Dacca, 1943.

Majumdar,R.C. and Pusalker,A.D. - The History and Culture of the Indian People. Vol. IV : The Age of Imperial Kanauj. Bombay, 1955. Vol. V : The Struggle for Empire. Bombay, 1957. Vol. VI : The Delhi Sultanate. Bombay, 1960.

Majumdar,R.C., Raychaudhuri,H.C. and Datta,K. - An Advanced History of India. London, 1958.

Majumdar,S.N. - Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India. Calcutta, 1924.

Marshall, Sir J.H. - A Guide to Sanchi. Calcutta, 1918.

Masumdar,B.P. - Socio-Economic History of Northern India (1030-1194 A.D.). Calcutta, 1960.

Mitra,S.K. - The Early Rulers of Khajuraho. Calcutta, 1958.

Mohan,K (Miss) - Kashmir under the Loharas (A.D. 1003-1171). Thesis for Ph.D. University of London, 1958.

Mookerji,R.K. - A History of Indian Shipping and maritime activity. London, 1912.

Motīcandra - Sārthavāha. Patna, 1953.

Nadavī, Saiyada Sulemāna - Araba aur Bhārata ke Sambandha. Tr. by Rāmacandra Varmmā. Allahabad, 1930.

Nainar,S.M.H. - Arab Geographers' knowledge of South India. Madras, 1942.

Nathk, Pran - A study in the economic condition of Ancient India. London, 1924.

Niyogi,R (Miss) - The History of the Gāhaḍavāla Dynasty. Calcutta, 1959.

Ojha,G.H. - Madhyakālīna Bhāratīya Saṃskṛti. Allahabad, 1951.

Pirenne,H. - Economic and Social History of Mediaeval Europe. London, 1936.

Poole, A.Lane - Obligations of Society in the XII and XIII centuries. Oxford, 1946.

Prasad, Beni - State in Ancient India. Allahabad, 1928.

Prasad, Iahwari - History of Medieval India. Allahabad, 1925.

Puri,B.N. - The History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras. Bombay, 1957.

Poujade,J. - La Route des Indes et ses Navires. Paris, 1946.

Raffles,T.S. - The History of Java. London, 1830.

Rapson, E.J. - Ancient India. Cambridge, 1916.

Ray,H.C. - Dynastic History of Northern India. 2 Vols. Calcutta, 1931, 1936.

Ray,P. - History of Chemistry in Ancient and Medieval India. Calcutta, 1956.

Sarkar,B.K. - The Positive Background of Hindu Sociology. Book I Allahabad, 1914.

Sastri, K.A.N. - The Colas. 2 Vols. Madras, 1935, 1937.

Sastri, K.A.N. - Foreign Notices of South India. Madras, 1939.

Sen,B.C. - Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal. Calcutta, 1942.

Sharma,D. - Early Chauhān Dynasties. Delhi, 1959.

Singh,R.C.P. - Kingship in Northern India (cir. 600 A.D.-1200 A.D Thesis for Ph.D. University of London, 1957.

Sircar,D.C. - Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India. Delhi, 1960.

Smith,V.A. - Early History of India. Oxford, 1924.

Subba Rao,N.S. - Economic and Political Conditions in Ancient India. Mysore, 1911.

Thomas,E. - The Chronicles of the Pathan kings of Delhi. London, 1871.

Titus,M.T. - Indian Islam. London, 1930.

Tripathi,R.S. - History of Kanauj. Banaras, 1937.

Vaidya,C.V. - History of Mediaeval Hindu India. 3 Vols. Poona, 1921-26.

Yadav,B.N.S. - Some Aspects of Society in Northern India in the 12th century A.D. Thesis for D.Phil. University of Allahabad, 1956.

Yazdani,G. - The Early History of the Deccan. 2 Vols. London, 1960.

E. Journals, Periodicals and Reports.

Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of Western India.

Annual Report of the Rajputana Museum, Ajmer.

Archaeological Survey of India, Reports by A.Cunningham.

Arts and Letters.

Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en VolkenKunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Instituut voor de Taal-, land en VolkenKunde van Nederlandsch Indië.

Bulletin de l' École Française d' Extrême Orient, Hanoi.

Chinese Literature. Foreign Language Press, Peking.

Hindustānī.

Epigraphia Indica.

Indian Antiquary.

Indian Archaeology.

Indian Culture.

Indian Historical Quarterly.

Islamic Culture.

Journal Asiatique.

Journal of Indian History.

Journal of the American Oriental Society.

Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society.

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society.

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of the Department of Letters, University of Calcutta.

Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient.

Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art.

Journal of the Malaya Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.

Journal of the Oriental Institute, M.S. University of Baroda.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Journal of the Royal Geographical Society of London.

Journal of the U.P. Historical Society.

Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Nāgarī Pracāriṇī Patrikā.

Numismatic Chronicle.

Proceedings and Transactions of the All-India Oriental Conference.

Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Proceedings of the Indian History Congress.

Sino-Indian Studies.

Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde.

T'oung Pao.

Uttara Bhāratī.

F. Dictionaries, Catalogues, etc.

Bombay Gazetteer.

Dalal, C.D. and Gandhi, L.B. - A Descriptive Catalogue of MSS

in the Jain Bhandars at Jesalmere. Baroda, 1923.

Encyclopaedia Britanica.

Monier-Williams, . - A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Oxford, 1899.

'Rasāla', Ramāśaṅkara Śukla - Bhāṣā-śabda-koṣa. Allahabad, 1937.

Sheth, Hargovindā Das T. - Pāiá Sadda Mahaṃṇavo. Calcutta, 1928.

Varmā, Rāmacaṃdra - Saṃkṣipta Hindī Śabda Sāgara. Banaras,
V.S. 2008.

Copy of the article to be published in B.S.O.A.S., XXV, Part 3

THE DATE OF THE ŚUKRANĪTI

Ever since the publication of the text, scholars have determined the date of the composition of the Śukranīti variously. Oppert[1] placed it very early in the period of the Smṛti and early epic literature. V.S. Agrawala[2] and Syamlal Pandya[3] regard it as a work of the Gupta period. But generally the text is utilised for the early medieval period, preferably the eleventh or the twelfth century.[4] Rajendra Lal Mitra[5] held that the work could not be older than the sixteenth century. Sanskritists[6], following the lead of Keith[7] and Kane[8], dismiss the text as of quite a late date and hence

---

1. Preface p. viii., Cf. Pradhan (Modern Review, February 1916)- Kingship in Śukranīti.
2. Harsacarita, eka Sāṁskṛtika adhyayana, p. 219.
3. Śukra kī Rājanīti (Lucknow, 2009 V.S.), Ch. IX.
4. A.S.Altekar, State and Government in Ancient India, pp. 19f; U.N.Ghoshal, A History of Indian Political Ideas, pp. 494f; B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, Preface pp. x-xi; Yogesh Chandra Ray, I.H.Q., VIII p. 585. Cf. R.C.Majumdar in The Struggle for Empire, p. 285 f.n. 9. K.P.Jayaswal (Modern Review, February 1916 - Review of Ramanathan's Criminal Justice in Ancient India) mentioned it as a product of the eighth century. A.S.Altekar in the 1949 edition of his book (p. 12) accepted this date.
5. See Panchanan Neogi, Iron in Ancient India, pp. 32f. Cf. S.N.Sen, The Military System of the Marathas, p. 5 f.n. 2. J.D.M.Derrett refers to the Śukranīti as a text of the 14th-15th centuries - Them International and Comparative Law Quarterly Vol. 11 pt. 1 (1962), p.267 f.n. 3.
6. See the Struggle for Empire, p. 328.
7. A History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 464.
8. History of Dharmaśāstra, I.116. He places the text about 1300 A.D. - ibid., III p. 121 f.n. 162.

not applicable to the Hindu period.

Of late the opinion has been gaining ground among scholars that the text was forged by some Pandit in the nineteenth century to please some Sahab enthusiastic about old texts.[1] The view originated with Prof. V.Raghavan of Madras.[2] Deriving our inspiration from him we discuss here some grounds for regarding the text as a composition of the nineteenth century.

The original objection of R.L.Mitra and P.C.Ray[3] against the early date proposed for the Śukranīti was that the text mentions guns and cannons. The earlier date has sometimes been supported on the basis of references to fire-arms in early Sanskrit works.[4] There is no doubt that incendiary arrows were used in ancient India.[5] But as has been rightly contended by several authorities the fire weapons of earlier works were not real fire-arms in the sense that they did not contain anything of the nature of gun-powder.[6] In discussing

---

1. K.A.N.Sastri in his review of B.P.Mazumdar's Socio-Economic History - J.I.H., 1961.
2. It was after the first draft fs of the article was prepared that I received a copy of his Presidential Address sent to me very kindly by Prof. V.Raghavan (XXI All-India Oriental Conference).
3. See H.W.L.Hime, Origin of Artillery (London, 1915), pp.74-85.
4. V.R.R.Dikshitar, War in Ancient India, pp. 102-105.
5. Cf. Medhātithi on Manu VII.90.
6. P.C.Ray, History of Hindu Chemistry, I pp. 177ff; P.C. Chakravarti, Art of War in Ancient India, pp. 173f; J.C.Ray, I.H.Q., VII and VIII. See also N. I.A., II pp. 169ff.

the question it is often forgotten that nitre, one of the ingredients of gun-powder, was unknown in ancient times.[1] The account of the small nālika and the large nālika, their construction and the method of their use, and the agni-cūrṇa with suvarci salt (nitre) as one of its principal ingredients and the balls made of iron, lead or any other metal[2] does not leave any doubt that them Śūkranīti describes a modern gun and cannon with gun-powder and bullets. This would mean that the Śukranīti could not hawe existed in its present form before the sixteenth century, because, though guns were introduced in Southern India by the Portuguese at Goa in c. 1510 A.D., their first extensive use in Indian warfare was at Panipat in 1526 A.D. It has been quite fashionable with scholars accepting an early date for the Śukranīti to treat these lines as interpolations.[3] But references to guns are not confined to one or two sections of the text but occur incidentally in other contexts[4] also, which disproves the theory of inter-

---

1. Dutt, Materia Medica of the Hindus, pp.89f.
2. IV.7.388-421.
3. B.K.Sarkar, Śukranīti (tr.), p. 236 f.n. 1; B.P.Mazumdar, Socio-Economic History, Preface, p. xi; also p. 60.
4. I.477 - the wall of the town to be provided with guns; I.506-12 - stationing of guns and ordnances in the lay-out ef of the city; II.181-90 - the saciva is to study and report is to the king the various classes of ammunition and how many troops are well equipped with arms, ordnance and gun-powder; II.393-96 - the list of officers whom a king should appoint for his welfare includes (gunners) who can pierce

(Continued)

polation and suggests that the passages about guns are intrinsic parts of the text.

Another indication which is utilised for determining the date of the text is the references to the Yavanas and Mlecchas. Yavana originally derived from Iona or Ionians came to refer to a Greek or any foreign people coming from the west. Mlecha meaning a barbarian is also used for a foreigner and is often used specifically for a Muslim. According to the Śukranīti the Yavana philosophy recognises God as the invisible creator of the universe, and recognises virtue and vice without reference to Śruti and Smṛti, and believes that Śruti contains a separate religious system.[1] Later on it describes the Yavanas as containing all the four castes mixed together,

---

(Continued)
the objects they aim at by the balls thrown out of big cannons and those who make gun-powder and cannon-balls; IV.2.60 - gun-powder in the list of things useful and instrumental for the purposes of man which are to be accumulated by a king; IV.7.41 - cannon in the list of the relative proportion of the constituents of the army; IV.7.47-52 - the annual military establishment of the ruler whose income is a lac of karṣas includes three hundred foot-soldiers armed with lesser fire-arms or guns and two larger fire-arms or cannons; IV.7.53-8 - the monthly items of expenditure of the ruler with an income of a lac of karṣas includes four hundred on elephants, camels, bulls and fire-arms; IV.7.668-77 - of the four types of war, according as they are fought with charmed instruments, mechanical instruments, weapons or hands, that with mechanical instruments leads to great destruction of the enemy because in it balls are flung at the objective by the application of gun-powder in cylindrical fire-arms and the one with weapons is generally undertaken in the absence of fire-arms and other missiles; IV.7.686-88 - in fighting with an enemy whose ministers and army have become disaffected the fire-arms both light and
(Continued)

recognising authority other than that of the Vedas, living in the north-west, and having their own śāstras framed for their welfare by their own masters.[2] One can see from these descriptions that Yavana of this text stands for a Muslim. We would suggest that Mlecchа of the text also denotes a Muslim. There is no reference in the Śukranīti which uses Yavana and Mlecchа side by side nor has it any indication to preclude the identity of the two. The suggestion of identity would receive support from the fact that in one place our text says that the rules of the Yavanas followed for ordinary purposes are the same as those of the śāstras[3] and elsewhere it observes that the law of the śāstras always binds even the Mlecchas.[4] In one context the text speaks of the division of

---

(Continued)
heavy are to be placed in the front; IV.7.707-11 - use of fire-arms for exterpating foes.

1. IV.3.124-26-Īśvaraḥ kāraṇaṃ yatrādṛśyo'sti jagatassadā.
Śrutismṛtī vinā dharmādharmaustastacca Yāvanaṃ.
Śrutyādibhinnadharmo'sti yatra tadyāvanaṃ mataṃ.
2. IV.4.74-76-Sasaṃkaracaturvarṇā ekatraikatra yāvanāḥ.
Vedabhinnapramāṇāste pratyaguttaravāsinaḥ.
Tadācāryaiśca tacchāstraṃ nirmitaṃ taddhitārthakaṃ
3. IV.4.77-Vyavahārāya yā nītirubhayoravivādinī.
~~xxxxxxxxx~~.
4. IV.5.585-6-Vidito'rthāgamaśśāstre tathā varṇaḥ pṛthak pṛthak.
Śāsti tacchāstradharmaṃ yanmlecchānāmapi tatsadā.

society into the four traditional castes and the Mlecchas[1] while in another it refers to the Yavanas beside the four castes.[2]

Yogesh Chandra Ray[3] places the last revision of the Śukranīti in the eleventh century on the basis of the reference in the text to the Yavanas living in the Paścimottara[4], which is taken to stand for the Yamini Turks occupying the Punjab after its conquest by Mahmūd of Ghazni. We feel that the passage x refers only to a comparative preponderance of the Muslims in the north-west and does not imply that the Muslims were restricted only to the north-west. It is clear from the text that it belongs to an age when the Muslims had spread in most parts of India in such large numbers as to have been regarded as such an integral part of the social structure that the Mlecchas or Yavanas are added to the traditional four-fold division of society. The knowledge and interest in the Yavana philosophy reflected in its inclusion in the list of the thirty-two vidyās enumerated in the text[5] best suits a period

---

1. I.75-88. Na jātyā brāhmaṇaścātra kṣatriyo vaiśya eva ca.
   Na śūdro na ca vai mlecchо bhedità guṇakarmabhiḥ-
   Tyaktasvadharmācaraṇā nirghṛṇāḥ parapīḍakāḥ.
   Caṇḍālā himsakā nityam mlecchāste hyaviveкinaḥ-
2. IV.4.69-77.
3. I.H.Q., VIII.585.
4. IV.4.74-75. Paścimottara may mean either north-west or north and west.
5. IV.3.51-59, 124-26.

when the Muslims had settled permanently in India. The early centuries of the arrival of the Muslims as the date of the Śukranīti would ill-suit the passage which refers to the possibility of the king making people descended from Mlecchas his commanders and soldiers.[1]

At one place the Śukranīti[2] defines Mlecchas as those who have given up practising their own duties, who are unkind and troublesome to others, and who are very excitable, envious and foolish. This looks like the contempt of an orthodox Brāhmaṇa for the Muslims, especially those converted from Hinduism and hence more fanatic. This incidentally also points to a period when conversion to Islam had gone far ahead. Leaving aside this, the general impression of the passages referring to the Mlecchas and Yavanas indicates peaceful relations with them, with a sympathetic attitude towards their religion and social system and also a concern for their welfare. This state of affairs would not have been possible in the early centuries of the triumphant expansion of militant Islam. This account also

---

1. II.276-80. Śūdrā vā kṣatriyā vaiśyā mlecchāssaṃkarasaṃbhavāḥ. Senādhipāssainikāśca kāryā rājñā jayārthinā.- It is to be noted that the army of Balaji Baji Rao was completely denationalised enlisting mercenaries not only from the different parts of India but also Rohillas, Arabs, Abyssynians and Portuguese- S.N.Sen, Military System of the Marathas, p.62. It is well known that the armies of the Maratha chiefs, Sultāns of Hyderabad and other Deccan kings often employed even English and French commanders. What is significant is that in the Maratha army of all the foreigners the Arabs enjoyed the highest reputation for valour and intrepidity - S.N.Sen, loc. cit., pp. 66f.
2. I.87-88.

suits the feelings of accord between the Hindus and Muslims which are known to have existed down to the nineteenth century when for political reasons efforts were made to accentuate their differences and antagonism.

Another reference in the Śukranīti[1] which may also suggest the date of its composition is one in which the cases created by the killing of cows, women and Brāhmaṇas are mentioned as one of the most justifiable grounds of war, when the king should not bother himself about the proper time or opportune season for warfare. Obviously killing of cows, or Brāhmaṇas would not have been a cause of war in Hindu India and B.K. Sarkar[2] rightly pointed out that "the work must be attributed to a period not preceding the advent of the Mussalmans with their alien creed". We feel that these causes for war were applicable to later times when the Muslims had settled in India and people had become well-acquainted with their depredations. In this respect B.K.Sarkar seems to have been nearer to the truth when he incidentally pointed out the similarity between this reference and the war-cry of Shivaji in the seventeenth century.

The scheme of punishments envisaged in the Śukranīti also gives a clue about the probable date of its composition. For

---

1. IV.7.453-Na kālaniyamastatra gostrīvipravināśane.
2. Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, Vol. I p.259.

the second (madhyama) class man committing a first (prathama) class offence it suggests in the last resort imprisonment and menial work,[1] for the worst (adhama) class committing a second class (madhyama) offence it enjoins even imprisonment with forced labour on thex roads, but for the worst class committing the worst (adhama) offence it recommends imprisonment for life and forced menial labour.[2] One who commits sins should not be killed but should be imprisoned and made to perform ignoble work for a month, three months, six months, one year or for his whole life.[3] It gives a long list of bad characters and offenders[4] whom it recommends in the first instance to be expelled from the territory and then, probably in case they returned, to be bound and transported to islands and forts, and employed in the work of repairing roads and made to live on insufficient and bad diet.[5] It advises the king to bind in chains men who wander about after forsaking parents and wives, to put them to work repairing the roads, and to pay them half the standard

---

1. IV.1.155-58. Saṃrodhaṃ nīcakarma ca - 1.158.
2. ibid.167-72. Saṃrodhanaṃ nityam mārgasaṃskaranārthakam -1.169; Yāvajjīvaṃ baṃdhanaṃ ca nīcakarmaiva kevalam - 1.172.
3. ibid.181-83. Nīcakarmakaraṃ kuryādbaṃdhayitvā tu pāpinam - 1.181.
4. ibid.192-214.
5. ibid.215-18-Svabhāvaduṣṭānetān hi jñātvā rāṣṭrādvivāsayet.
   Dvīpe nivāsitavyāste badhvā durgodare'thavā.
   Mārgasaṃskaraṇe yojyāḥ kadannanyūnabhojanāḥ.
   Tattajjātyuktakarmāṇi kārayati ca tairnṛpaḥ.

wages.[1] It is clear that according to the Śukranīti the work of repairing roads was a common method of punishing offenders and criminals. Elsewhere also it says that a king should have the roads repaired every year with gravel by men who have been sued or imprisoned.[2] In the entire range of Indian history whether under Hindu or Muslim rule we do not find any definite policy of employing prisoners in constructive work.[3] It is under the East India Company and the British rule that we first find the practice of utilising prisoners for constructive work and remunerating them. We have seen above that the Śukranīti makes it a definite policy of the state to use islands as convict settlements. There is no other evidence that such a practice was even thought of in the Hindu and Muslim periods of Indian history. Leaving aside a few kingdoms in south India we do not know of much effort to maintain control over coastal islands; nor was this possible for many of the Indian kingdoms which were land-locked. It was however the policy of the East India Company and the British rule which controlled the coastal islands. Under them the convicts were given the punishment of

---

1. ibid.229-31. Nigaḍairbaṃdhayitvā taṃ yojayenmārgasaṃskṛtau. Tadbhṛtyardhaṃ tu saṃdadyāt tebhyo rājā prayatnataḥ.- II.230-31.
2. I.536-37-Mārgān sudhāśarkarairvā ghaṭitān prativatsaraṃ. Abhiyuktaniruddhairvā kuryād grāmyajanairnṛpaḥ.
3. See the Daṇḍanīti of Keśavapaṇḍita, p.5, v.47 - dhanadānāsahaṃ buddhvā svādhīnaṃ karma kārayet.

transportation for life at the Andaman and Nicobar islands which in popular usage was known as them sentence of kālāpāni. We may cite here some of the sections in the Bombay Regulation III of 1802 which to me appears to be the prototype from which these regulations in the Śukranīti are derived. Section II of this Regulation provides for the expulsion from within the limits of the jurisdiction of a magistrate all vagrants, thieves, robbers, and swindlers of noted evil repute. Section III provides that in case they return within the jurisdiction without the sanction of the magistrate he is to apprehend their persons and commit or hold them to bail for trial at the next Court of session, which may sentence any of the said parties to hard labour on the roads, or in cleansing the streets or repairing the fortifications, under custody of the Magistrate, and having light irons on their legs, for any period not exceeding two years. Section IV of the Regulation lays down that if any convict escapes from jail, or other place of confinement, or from the roads, or any other place where they may be employed, on being reapprehended may also be declared liable to transportation to some other place

beyond sea.[1] Sections XXIV and XXVI of both Regulation V of 1799 and Regulation III of 1800 of Bombay provide for the customary daily subsistence money to all prisoners and also on their release after a confinement of six months or upwards a sum sufficient for a month's subsistence if they stand in need of it.[2]

The Śukranīti gives a list of practices and professions for doing which the subjects had to obtain the permission of the king,[3] most likely in the form of a royal patent, charter or licence. These are : gambling, drinking, hunting, use of arms, sales and purchases of cows, elephants, horses, camels, buffaloes, men, immovable property, silver, gold, jewels, intoxicants and poisons, distillation of wines, the drawing up of deeds indicating a sale, gift of loan and medical practice. It is really interesting to find that Article Ist under Title 6th of the Bombay Rule, Ordinance and Regulation I of 1812 requires the Petty Sessions to cause exact lists to be taken and kept of all houses licensed to sell spirits, of all houses where bhang or opium is usually taken, of all houses of public gambling, of all

---

1. For transportation beyond sea see Bengal Regulations LIII of 1803 (sec. VIII cl.2), IX of 1813 (sec. II cl.3) and XIV of 1816 (sec. XV) and Madras Regulation XV of 1803 (sec. VII cl.2 For punishment of hard labour in irons, particularly in repairing public roads, see Bengal Regulations LIII of 1803 (sec. VIII cl.3), II of 1834 (sec. III cl.1) and IV of 1823 (sec. VII) and Madras Regulations VI of 1827 (sec. VI cl.2) and X of 1832.
2. Sec. II cl.2 of the Bengal Regulation XIV of 1811 provides that persons sentenced to imprisonment for life may be employed in the manufacture of articles constantly in demand.
3. I.603-8.

shops and warehouses where goods are received in pawn; and of all goldsmiths and sellers or buyers of gold and silver. This covers most of the professions and activities in the Śukranīti. Those which appear to be additional in the Śukranīti list are hunting,(mrgayā), use of arms (śastradhārana), sale and purchase of poisons and medical practice (cikitsam). In ancient times we do have some regulations for the protection of animal life in certain special forests otherwise there was no general restriction on hunting. The necessity for the promulgation of game laws and of sportsmen carrying licenses reflects the modern concern for the preservation of game and forests. We do not know any evidence which may suggest that in ancient times the state prohibited unlicensed arming. On the contrary carrying of weapons in those times was viewed as necessary for self-defence and protection. It became the practice of the state only after the establishment of the British rule to put an effective check on the use of arms by unauthorised persons. Title seventh of the Bombay Rule, Ordinance and Regulation I of 1812 prohibits people from arming with guns, pistols, swords, daggers, creases, knives or other weapons by which mortal wounds are usually inflicted. As regards poisons we find that Title 8 of the Bombay Rule, Ordinance and Regulation I of 1812 and the Bombay Regulation V of 1814 prohibit the selling of poisonous substances without a licence. Likewise the system of the State registration

of medical practitioners is not testified for earlier times. It is a practice essentially modern in origin.

The Śukranīti[1] provides for the establishment of inns (pānthaśālā) between every two villages. The inn-keeper (śālādhipa) was to enquire from a traveller coming to it and properly record his name, family, caste, permanent residence, from where he came and why, where he was going, the attendants and conveyances with him and the arms in his possession. He was to collect the travellers' arms in the evening before they went to sleep and was to give them back when the travellers left in the morning. The emphasis on preventing a misuse of weapons affords an interesting comparison with Article 4 under Title 7 of the Bombay Rule, Ordinance and Regulation I of 1812 which declares punishable all masters and keepers of taverns, spirit houses, bhang or opium shops, or gaming houses, who suffer any persons with dangerous weapons to enter their houses. It is not unlikely that the author of the Śukranīti had in his mind this Regulation when he described the duties of an inn-keeper about the arms carried by the travellers.

The Śukranīti includes in its list of bad characters to be punished those who pursue penances and learning without maintaining relatives and also those who live on alms though capable of

---

1. I.538-49.

collecting wood and grasses.[1] No doubt even in some of the early legal texts we find that the king is required to punish those who accept the garb of an ascetic to escape from their social responsibilities.[2] It is however interesting to compare the provision with the Bombay Rule, Ordinance and Regulation I of 1813 which aimed at preventing parents and others from deserting their children or other connections dependent on them for support and lays down punishment for those who, being able to labour, yet run away from or leave their families without any provision.

At one place the Śukranīti[3] lays down that those who have let out bulls and other animals after religious observances must keep them within proper control. No other legal text of the earlier times imposes this responsibility on the man letting out animals.[4] It is not unlikely that the injunction in the Śukranīti was incorporated to appease the feeling of European masters about the annoyance and inconvenience caused by the religious bulls roaming freely in the bazars. Bombay Rule, Ordinance and

---

1. IV.1.209-10-Vinā kuṭumbabharaṇāttapovidyārthinaṃ sadā.
   Tṛṇakāṣṭhādiharaṇe śaktassan bhaikṣyabhojakaḥ.
2. Artha II.1 - if a person embraces the order of ascetics without making proper provision for his wife and sons he shall be punished with the first ammercement. See Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, II pp. 931 f.
3. I.622-Utsṛṣṭā vṛṣabhādyā yaistaiste dhāryāssuyamtritāḥ.
4. Śrī Kṛṣṇa Tarkālaṅkāra also says that the owner must maintain the beast and is responsible for damage. See Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft for 1962, p.38, n.79.

Regulation II of 1813 provides for the erection of public pounds for animals straying or trespassing on the public streets or roads or on the grounds of the inhabitants. Expenses of the maintenance of such cattle are required to be paid by the owners, from whom fees are also to be collected to a certain extent (Article VI). Article X lays down that in all cases where it shall appear to the magistrates sitting in Petty Sessions, that the owner or owners of any such vagrant animals shall not have used due diligence and care in confining them, or shall have willingly or repeatedly suffered them to remain at large, or that such vagrant animals have trespassed on or damaged the ground or premises of others fines may be levied on the owners.

In connection with the arrangements for the realisation of land revenue the Śukranīti advises a king to give to each cultivator a deed of rent having his own mark.[1] We know that in ancient times brāhmaṇas, learned men and religious institutions used to be given charters recording the grant of villages and pieces of land and that in later times the practice was extended to secular grants made to feudatories, officers and military chiefs. But nowhere do we get any indication that the common cultivator received any charter recognising his proprietorship over the

---

1. IV.2.47-Dadyāt pratikarṣakāya bhāgapatraṃ svacihnitaṃ.

land under him.[1] The need for such arrangements would not normally arise, because the cultivator would have an existing title to the soil. The passage in Śukra suggests either the case of a new cultivator occupying the land or a new government coming to power or a new arrangement being introduced. We learn from the Bombay Regulation I of 1808 (sections XLI-XLIV) that the existing system of the collection of land revenue was highly unsatisfactory causing much inconvenience to the government and hardships to the cultivators. The cultivators had no title to the land and the system of realising revenue in the form of a share of the grain did not work well and did not leave much incentive to the cultivator. In a proclamation issued by the Governor in Council on the 7th of August, 1801 the policy of issuing deeds of property to peasants with a view to ameliorate their conditions was given wide publicity. These deeds were in English, Portugese and Marathi languages and were issued through the Collector, under the seal of the Company and the signature of the Secretary to the Government. They contained the stipulation that those of the present occupants of the soil who got the deed received thereby a fixed and permanent

---

1. In the Caṇḍīkāvya poem a king requests a certain person to settle in his city and engage in agriculture and, in enumerating the benevolent favours which he would extend to the latter, says that he would affix his signature in the document containing the lease. See T.C.Dasgupta, Aspects of Bengali Society, pp. 312f.

proprietary right in the soil. The deeds contained the amount payable to the government by way of revenue which was moderate and fixed and was derived by commuting the government's share of the grain produce, subject to future valuation of the grain. But the amount of grain assessment, specified in each deed of property, was considered to be invariable to the present possessors and their posterity.[1]

In the Śukranīti a grāma (village) is defined as a piece of land a krośa in area and yielding one thousand silver karṣas.[2] This definition would suit the theory of Pran Nath[3] that villages mentioned in the literary and epigraphic records of ancient India were survey villages or estates; but this has been convincingly criticised by K.A.N.Sastri on the basis of referenes to grāma in Sanskrit literature.[4] In the Agni Purāṇa[5] even five families and a headman are said to form a village. But we have not found any other reference to a definition such as that in the Śukranīti. It is not unlikely that the author of the Śukranīti was reflecting the practice in the early years of the nineteenth century. Thus according to section XI of the Bombay

---

1. See Sec. III of the Madras Regulation XXV of 1802 for the grant of a deed of permanent property.
2. I.385-Bhavet krośātmako grāmo rūpyakarṣasahasrakaḥ.
3. Economic Conditions of Ancient India, pp. 33ff.
4. Journal of Oriental Research, IV pp. 211-25.
5. 165.11-Kuṭumbaiḥ pañcabhirgrāmaḥ ṣaṣṭhastatra mahattaraḥ.

Regulation II of 1814 a village yielding an annual revenue of not less than a thousand rupees was regarded as a unit, requiring the exclusive attention of a village accountant (tullatie).

The Śukranīti[1] advises that the king should train his salaried officers[2] in the cultivation of all the arts and sciences, and when they had finished their studies, should appoint them in their special fields. We may cite here the rules and regulations framed by the Government of Bombay in 1828 relating to the junior members of the Civil Service.[3] These young civilians were required to pass two examinations in Hindustani and in Marathi or Gujarati before they were entitled respectively to hold public employment and to be promoted to the second step in any department of the service. The Śukranīti envisages a regular system of promotion of officers according to their seniority and their qualifications to successively higher posts including the immediate advisers of the king. It says that if a person is unworthy of an office the king should appoint another after seeing that he is fit to discharge the functions, or in his place promote his immediate junior qualified for that task and in their

---

1. I.738-39-Sarvavidyākalābhyāse śikṣayedbhṛtipoṣitān. Samāptavidyaṃ saṃdṛṣṭvā tatkārye taṃ niyojayet.
2. Bhrti-positān may also mean stipendiaries and scholarship-holders.
3. The Days of John Company, Selections from Calcutta Gazette 1824-1832. Ed. A.C.Das Gupta (Calcutta, 1959), pp.318-21.

absence outsiders.[1] As the officer becomes qualified for higher and higher functions he should be promoted to these in succession at the end becoming a prakṛti ṛ (one of the ten immediate advisers).[2] Such a regular system of promotion envisages many grades of officers in the administration machinery and reveals a modern tendency.

The Śukranīti advises a king to mark those who are in his service by his own insignia according to the work in which they are employed. The insignia are to be made of steel, copper, bronze (rīti), silver, gold or jewels according to status. For distinguishing them at a distance the king should indicate the different offices of his officers by differences in their clothing, crowns, musical instruments and conveyances.[3] It is quite likely that there was in ancient times some form of a uniform to mark the government servants.[4] But the injunction in the Śukranīti for the insignia to differ according to the office or

---

1. II.228-30-Ataḥ kāryakṣamaṃ dṛṣṭvā kārye'nyaṃ taṃ niyojayet.
   Tatkārye kuśalaṃ cānyaṃ tatpadānugataṃ khalu.
   Niyojayedvartane tu tadabhāve tathāparaṃ.
2. II.232-33-Yathā yathā śreṣṭhapade hyadhikārī yadā bhavet.
   Anukrameṇa saṃyojyo hyaṃte taṃ prakṛtiṃ nayet.
3. II.853-57-Yatkārye viniyuktā ye kāryāṃkairaṃkayecca tān.
   Lohajaistāmrajai rītibhavai rajatasambhavaiḥ.
   Sauvarṇai ratnajairvāpi yathāyogyaissvalāṃchanaiḥ.
   Pravijñānāya dūrāttu vastraiśca mukuṭairapi.
   Vādyavāhanabhedaiśca bhṛtyān kuryāt pṛthak pṛthak.
4. See Bāṇa's Harṣacarita (N.S.P 1925), pp.52 and 62 for the dress respectively of a lekhahāraka and a dauvārika.

department looks modern. Clause I of Section IX of the Bombay Regulation V of 1814 prohibits private servants appearing dressed like sepoys and lascars while Clause 6 lays down that no person except the public officers of government should distinguish his servants with badges.[1] Restrictions on the use of uniforms and badges are to be found in the Bombay Regulation XXIII of 1827.[2]

A strong argument for placing the Śukranīti in the nineteenth century would be the rules about pleaders (niyogins).[3] It becomes clear from a perusal of these rules that the practice of engaging the services of a niyogin was very common in the period of the Śukranīti, it was a well-established practice, duly recognised in the judicial system as the most common way of fighting a case. It says that niyogins have to be appointed by the plaintiff and defendant who do not know the legal procedure, who are busy with other affairs, or who are otherwise incapacitated.[4] Friends, family members and relatives are said to represent the

---

1. See also Sec. IX of the Bengal Regulation XI of 1806.
2. Government of India Act XVIII of 1835 prohibits the wearing by any other person of any chuprass or badge intended to resemble any chuprass or badge worn by servants of the Government and lays down that every chuprass or badge worn by any person not being a servant of the Government, shall bear the name of the party by whom the wearer is employed.
3. IV.5.216-231.
4. IV.5.216-18.

case only as second alternatives.[1] The niyogin is to be appointed by the party and not by the king at his will.[2] Only a man who knows the law and the procedure of the law-suits is to be appointed as niyogin; if a man who does not know these receives fees (bhṛti) as a niyogin he should be punished by the king.[3] The niyogin is to receive as his fees 1/16, 1/20, 1/40, 1/80 or 1/160 of the value of the property or amount in dispute, becoming less and less as the claim in dispute becomes higher or if the same person serves as niyogin for many litigants.[4] Such a regular use of pleading with the fees of the pleaders also regulated by law is not known for any period of Indian history before the establishment of the British rule. The Smṛtis do not suggest that there existed any class of persons like modern legal practitioners recognised by the state.[5] The only reference in the entire

---

1. ibid.219-21.
2. ibid.230-Kāryo nityo niyogī na nṛpeṇa svamanīṣayā.
3. ibid.228-29-Dharmajño vyavahārajño niyoktavyo'nyathā na hi.
   Anyathā bhṛtigṛhṇantaṃ daṇḍayecca niyoginaṃ.
   According to Sections V and VI of Bombay Regulation XIV of 1802 the pleaders should have the knowledge of the Hindu or Muslim law and the Regulations enacted by the British government.
4. ibid.224-27. Yadi bahuniyogī syādanyathā tasya poṣaṇaṃ-1.227. B.K.Sarkar translates it to mean that if there be many men who are appointed as pleaders in combination they are to be paid according to some other way. This suits clause second of sections XI and XII of Bombay Regulation XIV of 1802 which provides that either party may engage two or more pleaders to conduct his suit or defence, but the party found liable in costs will not be answerable for more than the established fee of one pleader on behalf of the other party. See also Section XXX of the Madras Regulation XVI of 1816 and Section XXVI of the Bengal Regulation XXVII of 1814.
5. Kane - History of Dharmaśāstra, III p.288

range of the legal literature of ancient times which suggests some rudimentary form of pleading is a story appearing in the commentary of Asahāya.[2] Here a person called Smārtadurdhara, who had studied the Smṛtis, offers to support before the court by citing appropriate texts the claim of a party that it was not liable to pay a certain debt, and in return was promised a reward. It is however to be noted that in pleading for the party Smārtadurdhara makes the plea that he is a very old friend of the family. It was the Bengal Regulation VII of 1793 which for the first time put forth laws about the privileges, fees and responsibilities of lawyers. Significantly enough, the fees for pleaders suggested in the Śukranīti are similar to those laid down in the Bombay Regulation XIV of 1802. The rates specified in Section IX of this Regulation follow the principle that the percentage of the amount to be paid as fees to the pleader decreases as the amount increases, but the rates are 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, ¾ and ½ per cent.[3]

According to the Śukranīti the king is to maintain an adopted son in the interests of his territory as well as his

---

4. Kane, History of Dharmaśastra, III p. 288.
2. on Nārada, ṛṇādāna 4.
3. Section XXV of the Madras Regulation XVI of 1816 as well as the Bengal Regulation XXVII of 1814 give the rates as 5, 2, 1 and ½ per cent.

subjects.[1] In the entire range of Indian legal literature the question of a king having an adopted son has never assumed any importance.[2] History also does not show any such practice; the throne passed to the son, brother, uncle, cousin, nephew or any other relation of the king both according to the nearness of his claim and his ability to back up his claim by sufficient military strength. An adopted son was needed for offering funeral oblations but he could hardly have any great significance to the kingdom which was not always governed by rules of succession. It was after the coming of the East India Company and the promulgation of the Doctrine of Lapse that the question assumed a vital importance for the state. We wonder if the reference in the Śukranīti reflects a mind agitated over this much discussed question of the time and finding solace in justifying the practice of Indian rulers.

The Śukranīti says that a king should take away both the kingdom and all the property of other rulers who do not act according to nīti, establish courts in the territories of conquered rulers and give them pensions according to their character.[3]

---

1. II.65-66-Piṃḍadāne viśeṣo na putradauhitrayostvataḥ.
   Bhūprajāpālanārthaṃ hi bhūpo dattaṃ tu pālayet.
2. See the section on succession to the throne (rājyādhikārinirṇaya) in the Rājyadharmakaustubha of Anantadeva (G.O.S., Baroda, 1935) written in the third quarter of the seventeenth century.
3. I.758-60-Anyāyavartināṃ rājyaṃ sarvasvaṃ ca harennṛpaḥ.
   Jitānāṃ viṣaye sthāpyaṃ dharmādhikaraṇaṃ sadā.
   Bhṛtiṃ dadyānnirjitānāṃ taccāritryānurūpataḥ.

Later on also it discusses the policy towards a conquered king. After a territory has been acquired a king should grant to the conquered king maintenance beginning with the day of capture, half of it to his son and a quarter to his wife; or he should pay a quarter to the princes if well qualified, or a thirty-second part.[1] The text adds that a king should maintain the dispossessed rulers for the display of his own majesty by the bestowal of honours on them if they were well-behaved, but he should punish them if they were wicked.[2] The ground for attacking a ruler as contemplated here hardly finds a reference in the ancient legal texts. It looks like the justification offered by the East India Company when it deposed petty Indian kings on the ground that their administration was not functioning well. ✗ Though ancient texts also speak of a conqueror as organising the administration in the conquered kingdom, the reference in the Śukranīti only to the establishment of courts in the conquered territories may remind us of the policy of the East India Company in such cases to establish regular courts of justice in place of the existing arbitrary law. Thus Bombay Regulation XI of 1814 provides for the administration of justice within the territories

---

1. IV.7.801-4-Pararāṣṭre hṛte dadyādbhṛtiṃ bhinnāvadhiṃ tathā.
Dadyādardhāṃ tasya putre striyai pādamitāṃ kila.
Hṛtarājyasya putrādau sadguṇe pādasammitaṃ.
Dadyādvā tadrājyatastu dvātriṃśāṃśaṃ prakalpayet.

2. ibid.808-9-Svamahatvadyotanārthaṃ hṛtarājyān pradhārayet.
Prāṇmānairyadi sadvṛttān durvṛttāṃstu prapīḍayet.

of the Harbour of Malwan ceded to the East India Company by the Raja of Kolhapur by the Agreement concluded on the 1st of October, 1812. Regulation II of 1805 is of a similar nature. The legal works of India never think in terms of granting pensions to conquered rulers. They advocate the policy of reducing other kings to the status of a tributary, or of rooting out the defeated dynasty and assimilating the kingdom to the empire of the conqueror or else making a member of the defeated family his subordinate ruler in the conquered territory. The humane treatment advocated in the Śukranīti may reflect the policy of the East India Company to depose petty rulers and sanction them a maintenance allowance. The policy of maintaining dispossessed rulers for displaying one's own power and of bestowing honours on them would look like the British policy of patronising such rulers, and of parading the might of the British empire through the majestic Indian Rajas who often received grand titles and honours from the Crown.

The Śukranīti says that after conquering the enemy, the king should realise revenue from a portion of the territory or from the whole, and then gratify the subjects.[1] There is no parallel to this advice in theory or practice of ancient India. Here also

---

1. ibid. 751-52.

we find that the Marathas often forced the defeated rulers to yield to them the right to collect the revenue from certain parts of the conquered state. The East India Company also often compelled the defeated Indian rulers to transfer to them by way of compensation or penalty the revenues of some districts.

The Śukranīti advises a king never to allow a territory very near his own to be made over to another.[1] In ancient political thought we have the theory of maṇḍala based on the possible combination of friendly and antagonistic neighbours but nowhere do we find any advice or right like that contemplated in the Śukranīti. The known history of ancient times, does not show any occasion when such a claim was asserted. On the contrary the East India Company is known to have definitely claimed a right over the neighbouring smaller states, treated as protectorates, and it backed up its claim whenever there arose any dispute about the occupation of these neighbouring states by another power.

The Śukranīti[2] says that a king should not destroy a gang or community of criminals all at once if there be a whole group of offenders, but should extirpate them one by one, just as the calf sucks the teats of the mother-cow individually. This is no doubt realistic and common-sense advice and could have been suggested

---

1. ibid. 746-Svasamīpataraṃ rājyaṃ nānyasmādgrāhayet kvacit.
2. IV.1.223-24-Necchecca yugapaddhrāsaṃ gaṇadaustyai gaṇasya ca. Ekaikaṃ ghātayedrājā vatso'śnāti yathā stanaṃ.

by any thinker in any age. It is however interesting to note that the East India Company followed this very practice in destroying the powerful criminal communities of Pindaris and thugs.[1]

In this connection we may note another statement in the Śukranīti, that the unity of even thieves can lead to the destruction of the State.[2] In ancient works we have references to thieves and robbers attacking people, sometimes even armies on their journies, especially through the forests, and even sometimes raiding cities and villages. But we find no suggestion that such anti-social elements threatened the existence of the states or gathered political power and influence. We may therefore suggest that the author of the Śukranīti was thinking of the Pindaris and Thugs, especially the former who had assumed political importance and had become a power to be reckoned with, threatening the existence of smaller states and challenging the power even of the mighty East India Company.

The Śukranīti[3] says that if thieves steal something from another kingdom by the king's order, they should first give one-sixth to the king and then divide the rest among themselves. The employment of trained robbers to harass an enemy was no doubt a time-honoured custom among the Hindus. Bṛhaspati[4] has the same

---

1. P.I.S.Tuker, The Yellow Scarf (The Story of the life of Thuggee Sleeman) (London, 1961).
2. V.116-Api rāṣṭravināśāya corāṇāmekacittatā.
3. IV.5.610-11.
4. S.B.E., XXXIII p. 241.

advice to give as found in the Śukranīti. The Arthaśāstra also recommends the employment of brave thieves and wild tribes who make no distinction between friend and foe. It is however not unlikely that the author of the Śukranīti in incorporating the advice in his text was thinking of the predatory hordes of the Pindaris who during the Peshwa period shared their spoils with the state employing and protecting them.[1]

Elsewhere the text extends a piece of practical advice that a king should never trust the king whose confidence has been created, and should never meet him in his house or some lonely place accompanied by a few troops.[2] We do not find this particular piece of advice to kings in any early source. We feel that it owes its origin to the incident in which Afzal Khan committed an identical mistake and suffered death at the hands of Shivaji.

Another piece of advice given by the Śukranīti in this connection is that the king should always keep beside him men who are very much like himself in dress and form; he should have a secret sign to distinguish himself, and at times should be like others.[3] This advice also is not to be found in any source from ancient India. European history knows some cases of this and

---

1. S.N.Sen, Military System of the Marathas, pp. 73f.
2. V.27-28.
3. V.29-30-Svaveṣarūpasadṛśān nikaṭe rakṣayet sadā.
Viśiṣṭacihnaguptassyāt samaye'nyādṛśo bhavet.

similar practices. In India we know that Rāṇā Pratāpa was once saved by one of his chiefs who himself put on the royal emblems when the former's life was threatened in a battle. Shivaji also escaped from many attempts at his life when others were mistaken for him.

Though use of diplomacy, strategy and deceit is referred to even in some of the earlier texts, such a policy is not favoured and is recommended only in exceptional cases. The ideal of righteous and chivalric war is otherwise laid down in these texts. As against this the Śukranīti is full of advice for resorting to cunning, deceitful and underhand means. These are mentioned in our text without any suggestion of stigma attached to them and as the regular and widely prevalent tactics. Thus it says that the king should always by gifts and artifices promote alienation or disaffection among the enemy's troops[1]; he should satisfy a very powerful enemy by service and humiliation, serve strong neighbours with honours and presents, and wage war on the weaker ones[2]; he should win over his equals by alliance or friendship and subjugate all by the policy of separation[3]; there is no other means of subjugating the foe except by causing disaffection among their soldiers[4]; one should follow nīti or the moral values

---

1. IV.7.370-71.
2. ibid.372-73. Also ibid.486, 488.
3. ibid.374.
4. ibid.375.

so long as one is powerful[1]; when the king is attacked by a powerful enemy and is unable to counteract him by any means, he should desire peace in a dilatory manner[2]; gifts should be given according to the strength of the adversary; even service may be accepted, or a king's daughter, wealth and property may be given away[3]; peace should be made even with the anāryas for otherwise they can overpower the ruler by attack[4]; he should protect himself at the proper time if the foes be many[5]; there is no precedent or rule that war should be undertaken with a powerful enemy[6]; prosperity never deserts a man who bows down to the powerful at the proper time[7]; the king should never trust the enemy even after concluding peace[8]; he should subjugate the enemy through protracted processes by which provisions are out short, food and fuel are diminished, and the subjects are oppressed[9]; when the ruler is not sure of them methods to be adopted, and is waiting for the opportune time, he should have resort to duplicity and display one move but really adopt another[10]; he should carefully protect his own troops, and extirpate the enemy's when they are tired

---

1. ibid.376.
2. ibid.474-75.
3. ibid.480.
4. ibid.482-3.
5. ibid.489.
6. ibid.490-91.
7. ibid.492.
8. ibid.494-95.
9. ibid.572-73. Also ibid.742-45.
10. ibid.581-83.

through long marches, hunger, thirst or disease or when they are weakened by various other dangers and difficulties[1]; there is no warfare which extirpates a powerful enemy as effectively as kūṭa-yuddha or war conducted against the dictates of morality[2]; in days of yore the kūṭa warfare was resorted to by Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Indra and other gods[3]; one should inspire confidence in the enemy by sweet smiling face, soft words, confession of guilt, service, gifts, humiliation, praise, good offices as well as oaths[4]; one should study the enemy's defects with a mind sharp as the razor[5]; the wise should place insult or humiliation in the front and honour or glory at the back in order to fulfil his desired object as it is folly to lose one's object[6]; one should sedulously destroy the enemy's troops by alluring them to sleep through acts of confidence and after fatigue due to keeping up of nights[7]; and one should commence military operations all of a sudden and withdraw also in an instant and fall upon the enemy like robbers from a distance.[8] A study of the career of Shivaji and the wars fought by him would make it clear that he did put into practice most of

---

1. ibid.694-700.
2. ibid.725.
3. ibid.726-27.
4. ibid.728-30.
5. ibid.731.
6. ibid.732-33.
7. ibid.742-44.
8. ibid.747-48.

these tactics. The history of Deccan after the coming of the Europeans powers reveals a peiod when wars were not fought according to the principles of righteousness, and when treachery and vile tactics were resorted to in the manner advocated by our text. One cannot help feeling that the Śukranīti reflects the practice of this period and taking a lesson from this the text for the first time in Indian history advocates these methods as ideal means of gaining victory.

The Śukranīti[1] advises a king to collect sufficient grain to meet the wants of three years, for his own good as well as for that of the commonwealth; he should not store corn affected by poison, fire or snow or eaten by insects, but should use it for immediate consumption and should carefully replace every year the exact amount of corn consumed. In ancient texts we often read among the requirements of a good fort that it should have provisions to last for a long time[2] but nowhere do we get any specific advice like that in the Śukranīti.[3] It appears that the Śukranīti thinks in terms of an area where forts played an important part in military operations. We know that Shivaji much relied on his forts and taking refuge in these was one of his

---

1. IV.2.50-59.
2. Manu VII.75; Mbh. II.5.36; Kāmandakīya IV.60; Matsyapurāna CCXVII.8; Viṣnudharmottara II.26.20-88.
3. There are references to show that the state had granaries for use during famines.

usual methods of defence against his opponents.[1] The generals of the Bijapur and Mughal armies could not capture these forts if they had sufficient provisions to stand a siege. Shivaji paid much attention to storing food-grains in these forts, which had ambarkhānās for this purpose. The one at Panhala had three enormous stone and cement granaries designed to hold 25000 khandis of grain.[2] Under the Peshawas the provisions of the forts were annually renewed; old grain was sometimes given to the garrision in lieu of pay and sometimes sold, and new grain was bought out of the proceeds.[3]

The Śukranīti enumerates ten prakṛtis (advisers) as functioning under a king.[4] It then adds that according to some the number of prakṛtis associated with a king is eight, whose names are Sumanta, Paṇḍita, Mantrī, Pradhāna, Saciva, Amātya, Prāḍvivāka and Pratinidhi.[5] In earlier legal texts there are many traditions about the number of ministers forming the council of a king.[6] But the author of the Śukranīti singles out for specific reference the view that the council of ministers should consist of eight. That he was not referring to a mere theoretical view would be suggested by the fact that he definitely

---

1. Cf. V.S.Bendrey, Dandanīti, Introduction, p.53.
2. S.N.Sen, Military System of the Marathas, p.80.
3. ibid., p.93.
4. II.141-43.
5. II.145-47.
6. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III pp.106f.

mentions the names of these eight advisers. It is interesting to compare this list with the Aṣṭapradhānas (council of eight ministers) which assisted Shivaji.[1] In the latter case also we find Amātya, Saciva, Mantrī and Sumanta. There should be no difficulty in equating Pradhāna and Paṇḍita of the Śukranīti respectively with Mukhya Pradhāna and Paṇḍita Rao of Shivaji's time. Likewise Prāḍvivāka of the Śukranīti may be the same as Nyāyādhīśa of Shivaji. The only difference in the two lists is that whereas the Śukranīti has Pratinidhi we find Senāpati under Shivaji. There can be two possibilities to explain the close similarity of the two lists. Either Shivaji formed his council according to the advice of the Śukranīti or the author of the Śukranīti knew the administrative machinery of Shivaji. We feel that the second suggestion has more likelihood because the Śukranīti seems to recognise the historicity of the system by making a special reference to it alone and not to other systems. And if Shivaji had formed his council after the advice of the Śukranīti he would have included ten advisers which is the number originally accepted in the text.

In the matter of military organisation the Śukranīti reveals many modern features; the fighting profession is thrown open to all and is not the monopoly or preserve of a particular group

---

1. J.G.Duff, History of the Marathas (London, 1826) Vol. I p.439; Ranade, Rise of the Maratha Power, pp.125f. Jadunath Sarkar, Shivaji and his Times (London, 1920), pp.411-13 has Dānādhyakṣa in place of Paṇḍita Rao.

or caste[1]; military officers are ranked according as they are heads of 5 or 6, 30, 100, 1000 and 10000 foot-soldiers[2]; appropriate uniforms are prescribed for the different ranks of officers[3]; military parads[4] (vyūhābhyāsa) should be held twice every day in the morning and the evening; the king annually withdraws money from the soldiers for their accoutrements[5]; military men should be kept away from civilians by stationing the troops outside the village, by not allowing them to enter the village without a royal permit and by preventing any credit-transactions between troops and villagers[6]; separate supply establishments should be maintained for the army and the goods intended for the

---

1. II.276-80, 865-68.
2. II.281-85.
3. II.296-Uktasamjñān svasvacihnairlāñchitāṁśca niyojayet.
4. II.286-87. Cf. IV.7.781-82.
5. IV.7.59-Prativarṣam svaveśārtham sainikebhyo dhanam haret. The modern practice is that the soldiers receive some amount for their uniforms; but they do not get it. The soldiers cannot purchase uniforms in the open market; The state grants these to the soldiers in exchange for the allowance or part of pay fixed for them.
6. IV.7.763-64, 772; V.180-82. Sainikairna vyavaharennityam grāmyajano'pi ca - 1.182. Section V of the Bombay Regulation VII of 1814 provides for compensation to landholders and other persons who sustain any injury from the march or encampment of troops. Section IX clause 5 of this Regulation forbids all persons to whom escorts may be allowed, to send sepoys or lascars into the village. Cf. Articles 1 and 2 under Section VII of Bombay Regulation II of 1829. Similar provisions are found in Section V cls 1-2 and Section IX cl.7 of the Bengal Reg. XI of 1806 and Madras Reg. III of 1810 and V of 1827, Section VII articles 1-3. Bombay Regulation XXIII of 1827 prohibits money transactions between certain civil officers and certain natives, and forbids these officers to employ their native creditors in official capacities without authority.

army should be reserved for the soldiers[1]; soldiers should be restricted only to military functions and not to be appointed to any other work besides warfare[2]; military regulations should be communicated to the soldiers every eighth day[3]; soldiers should not point to the defects of their commanders[4]; soldiers were required to keep their arms, weapons and uniforms bright[5]; provision is made for the king to receive the acknowledgments of the receipt of wages from the soldiers, and to give them forms specifying the amount of their wages[6]; and soldiers were to receive half pay when under military training.[7] The text lays down that before beginning an expedition a king should make his soldiers drink invigorating wines[8]. Though wine drinking was popular among warriors in ancient times we do not find in early sources

---

1. IV.7.765. Ch. IV of the Bombay Regualtion XXII of 1827 provides for the appointment, functions and authority of the Superintendent of bazars. Section XIX of this Regulation lays down penalties for receiving military equipment or stores. Cf. Section VI of Bombay Regulation II of 1829. See also Madras Regulations VI of 1809 and VII of 1832. Section VI of Madras Regulation V of 1827 prohibits officers from selling, misapplying or wilfully destroying military stores.
2. V.185-Yuddhakriyām vinā sainyaṃ yojayennānyakarmani.
3. IV.7.768.
4. ibid.773-74. See Madras Reg. V of 1827 sec. I, art. 2 for penalty for disrespectful behaviour to the Commander-in-chief and art. 5 for striking or drawing any weapon against a superior officer or disobeying orders.
5. ibid.775.
6. ibid.783-85.
7. ibid.786-87.
8. ibid.709-Pāyayitvā madaṃ samyak sainikān śauryavardhanaṃ.

any advice like that found in the Śukranīti. On the other hand this practice seems to have been quite common in the European armies. Thus Chapter IX in the Bombay Regulation XXII of 1827 contains rules relating to the sale of spirituous liquors at military stations and during a march.[1] But more important than these are the passages which mention the relative proportion of the constituents of an army[2] and the numerical strength of the different constituents in the army establishment of a ruler whose income is a lac of karṣas.[3] The proportion of the infantry to the cavalry given here is 4 : 1. We do not find this ratio in any evidence from ancient India. It is interesting to note that this very proportion was advocated and established by Napoleon.[4] It is not unlikely that some military ideas from France of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic era were imbibed by the Marathas of Gwalior through Commandant De Boigne or by the ruling circles of Hyderabad through General Raymond, or were learnt by Tipu, an ally and friend of Napoleon.[5] Again, it is clear that the Śukranīti definitely advocates a policy of restricting the number of elephants in the army. The relative proportion of the constitu-

---

1. See Madras Regulations VI of 1821, IV of 1827 and VII of 1832 for preventing the undue use of liquors by soldiers.
2. IV.7.41-46.
3. ibid.47-52.
4. E.A.Altham, Principles of War, Vol. I p.43.
5. B.K.Sarkar, Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, Vol. II pp. 66f.

ents of the army is 4 foot-soldiers, 1 horse, 1/5 bull, 1/8 camel, 1/32 elephants and 1/64 chariots.[1] The text further advises a king to have in the army a predominance of foot-soldiers, a medium quantity of horses, a small number of elephants, equal number of ~~elephants~~ bulls and camels, but never elephants in excess.[2] This reads very strangely, because though on occasions Indians in ancient times lost many a battle owing to their elephants, all ancient texts are unanimous in eulogising elephants as a part of the army and recommend their being employed in the largest possible numbers. It was the English army which decried dependence on elephant force and the Indians learnt the lessons of their earlier mistakes only from history books written after the coming of the English. Elephants do not appear to have formed a prominent feature of the Maratha army either under Shivaji or Sambhaji or Rajaram.[3] Likewise, though chariots seem to have gone out of use in Indian wars long before[4], they continued to find reference in works of the medieval period.[5]

The Śukranīti enjoins a ruler with the income of a lac of karsas to have a reserve force of 100 men, well-accoutred and decently equipped with weapons and missiles, and a main force of

---

1. IV.7.41-44, 47-52.
2. ibid.45-6.
3. S.N.Sen, Military System of the Marathas, p.76.
4. Chakravarti, Art of War in Ancient India, p.26; Dikshitar, War in Ancient India, p.166.
5. Rājanītiratnākara, p.40; Kṛtyakalpataryu, Rājadharma, p.95; Yuktikalpataru, p.7 v.45.

three hundred foot-soldiers.[1] The idea of keeping a reserve force does not seem to have been very fashionable in ancient India. On the contrary Indian armies are known to have lost a few battles because their enemies surprised them and overwhelmed them with their reserve forces.

The Śukranīti does not mention the śreṇī (guild) army in its account of the different kinds of army according to the source from which they are drawn.[2] The troops supplied by śreṇīs continue to be mentioned in the ancient Indian texts down to the Rājanītiratnākara[3] of Caṇḍeśvara, of the fourteenth century. But to a man of the nineteenth century the remarkable guild system of ancient India was not a living reality, nor was it present in the historical memory, as Indological research was still in its infancy. Hence the very idea of the troops of the śreṇīs would have seemed irrational and the author of the Śukranīti therefore avoided making any reference to them.

A significant feature of the administration contemplated in the Śukranīti, which may serve as an index for its date is the regular use of written documents in different activities. Thus it is said about the laws that the king should inform the subjects

---

1. IV.7.47-52.
2. ibid.17-30.
3. p. 35.

about them by the state drum and also place them at cross-roads as written notices.[1] In earlier legal texts as well as the literary works of ancient times we find state orders being promulgated by the beat of a drum.[2] The provision in the Śukranīti about giving wide publicity to the state proclamations by having them written and stuck as posters in public places such as the crossings of streets seems thoroughly modern. Again the Śukranīti advises a king to receive in written form the opinions of each of his ministers separately with all his arguments, compare them with his own opinion and then do what is accepted by the majority.[3] In earlier legal works though the king is said to consult his ministers, we nowehere find any reference to his asking for their written opinions. Generally the references emphasise that the king should seek their advice separately and in secret,[4] thereby indicating that he was to consult them

---

1. I.625-26-Iti prabodhayennityaṃ prajāśśāsanadimdimaiḥ.
   Likhitvā śāsanaṃ rājā dhārayeta catuṣpathe.
2. See Prabandhacintāmaṇi, p. 47, ll.1-2; Kathākośa, pp. 28f.
3. I.732-33. Pṛthak pṛthanmataṃ teṣāṃ lekhayitvā sasādhanaṃ - I.732.
4. Artha I.15 - All administrative undertakings must be preceded by consultation with ministers. The place for consultation should be so secluded that the conversation going on inside will not be heard outside. See also Manu VII.147-50; Yāj I.344; Kāmandakīya XI.53, 65f; Agnipurāṇa CCXXV.19. The Arthaśāstra (loc.cit.) further lays down that all business was to be transacted in the presence of the ministers; but if any one was absent his opinion was to be elicited by despatching a letter.

orally. Later on the Śukranīti[1] dismisses oral orders altogether from the administrative machinery and postulates that every administrative measure should be based on a written order. It says that the state servant is not to do anything without the king's written order; nor should the king command anything great or small without a written order. As to forget is human, a written document is the best guide. Both the king who commands without writing and the officer who does anything without written orders are thieves. In the following line the Śukranīti gives a very abstract conception, based on the use of written documents, which has a very modern approach. It says that the written document with the king's seal is the real king; the king is not the king. The system envisaged in the text is characteristically modern when the Śukranīti[2] requires an amātya, prince or others to submit a written report of the work in which they have been appointed as officer by the king once a day, month or year or

---

1. II.582-87-Na kāryaṃ bhṛtakaḥ kuryānnṛpalekhādvinā kvacit.
Nājñāpayellekhanena vināpaṃ vā mahannṛpaḥ.
Bhrāṃteḥ puruṣadharmatvāllekhyaṃ nirṇāyakaṃ paraṃ.
Alekhyamājñāpayati hyalekhyaṃ yat karoti yaḥ.
Rājakṛtyamubhau corau tau bhṛtyanṛpatī sadā.
Nṛpasaṃcihnitaṃ lekhyaṃ nṛpastanna nṛpo nṛpaḥ.

2. II.591-96-Yasmin yasmin hi kṛtye tu rājñā yo'dhikṛto naraḥ.
Sāmātyayuvarājādiryathānukramataśca saḥ.
Dainikaṃ māsikaṃ vṛttaṃ vārṣikaṃ bahuvārṣikaṃ.
Tatkāryajātalekhyaṃ tu rājñe samyaṅnivedayet.
Rājādyaṃkitalekhyasya dhārayet smṛtipatrakaṃ.
Kāle'tīte vismṛtirvā bhrāṃtissaṅjāyate nṛṇāṃ.

during many years. It advises the officer to keepx a memorandum or précis of the written orders passed by the king, for with time men forget or confuse things. It suggests an administrative procedure like the modern secretariat system in which a document was passed by a succession of officers before it received the approval of the king.[1] In the land grants of Bengal we do find expressions to indicate that they were seen or examined by officers before they received the signature of the king.[2] But they do not imply a regular hierarchy of officers scrutinising and submitting their notes on it before it received the formal approval of the king.

It is clear from the text that the principle of budgeting was very wide-spread in its times. The annual expenditure is distributed among different heads to which are assigned fixed shares in the total income. Thus it mentions the respective proportion of the income of a village to be appropriated for the head of the village (grāmapa), army, charity, people, officers and personal expenditure, the annual deposit of the surplus resulting therefrom being half of the income.[3] Later on it mentions the monthly expenditure of a ruler with an annual income of a lac of karṣas on seven items : (a) contingencies, charities

---

1. II.729-44.
2. See I.B. Vol. III.132-39 for the endorsement on the Madanpada grant of Viśvarūpasena.
3. I.631-5.

and personal wants, (b) clerks (c) councillors, (d) wife and children (e) men-of-letters (f) horsemen, horses and infantry, and (g) elephants, camels, bulls and fire-arms, and with a regular saving.[1] This practice of allocating shares of income to be spent on different items would seem to be a modern one. The earlier texts do not envisage a system of budgeting and of expending according to a deliberate scheme based on the respective importance of different items. The text gives practical details about the technique of keeping accounts.[2] This is also without any parallel in any other source.

The labour laws in the Śukranīti are remarkably modern in approach. The text anticipates modern ideas of popular welfare by voicing the need for an equitable rate of wages for labourers. Moderate remuneration is said to be that which supplies the indispensable food and clothing (avaśyaposyabharaṇā). Good wages are those by which food and clothing are adequately supplied (samānnāchādanārthikā) Low wages are those by which only one person can be maintained.[3] Wages are to be so fixed that the worker may maintain those who are his compulsory charges (avaśyaposyavarga).[4] The Śukranīti

1. IV.7.53-8
2. II.745-73
3. II.799-802.
4. II.805-6

even evinces ideas suggesting the fear of the masses, characteristic of much of the political thought of England and Europe generally around the time of the Battle of Waterloo. It describes workers getting low wages as enemies by nature, auxiliaries to others, always looking for opportunities for trouble and as plunderers of treasure and people.[1] It is to be noted that the remuneration given to the Civil Servants of the East India Company from the very beginning until towards the end of the eighteenth century was far from satisfactory. This produced much discontent. The Civil Servants had to resort to corrupt and nefarious practices which often were detrimental to the interests of the Company. This was a source of great worry to the Company and many efforts were made to raise the moral standard of the services. With a view to obtaining from the Civil Servants a high standard of public ethics and unflinching devotion to public business alone Cornwallis insisted on giving them decent salaries.[2] The Śukranīti mentions many provisions giving benefits to servants. Leave of absence for recreation and on the occasion of festivities is provided for.[3] The servant is given sickness benefit also. No part of the wages is to be

---

1. II.807-8-Ye bhṛtyā hīnabhṛtikāśśatravaste svayaṃkṛtāḥ.
   Parasya sādhakāste tu chidrakośaprajāharāḥ.
2. A.K.Ghoshal, Civil Service in India under the East India Company (Calcutta, 1944), pp. 38ff, 228ff.
3. II.815-8.

deducted if the illness lasts for half a fortnight. A servant who has put in one year's service is not to be dismissed during sickness, but should be relieved by a substitute. A highly qualified servant is to receive half the regular wages during sickness.[1] During sickness a servant is to receive three-fourths of his usual salary. On putting in five years service a servant is entitled to three months earned leave on full pay. The maximum leave with full pay which can be claimed on medical grounds is six months.[2] A servant is to receive a respite of fifteen days in a year[3], which significantly compares with the modern rules about casual leave in the administrative services. There are also rules about old age pensions. A man who has served for forty years should have pension for life at the rate of half his wages. In the case of his death the pension is to be enjoyed by his minor and incapable son or by his wife and his well-behaved daughters.[4] Like the modern system of bonus a servant is to receive one-eighth of the salary by way of reward every year, and if the work has been done with exceptional ability one-eighth of the services rendered.[5] If the servant dies on account of his work his son so long as he is a minor is

---

1. II.822-24.
2. II.819-21.
3. II.825.
4. II.826-29.
5. II.830-31.

to enjoy the same salary or a remuneration according to his own qualifications.[1] There is provision for a scheme resembling the modern provident fund. The master is to keep with him one-sixth or one-fourth of his servant's wages and to pay half of that amount or the whole in two or three years.[2] These regulations suggest nothing more than those of the East India Company or the Civil Services of the British period.[3]

The society reflected in the Śukranīti is very near to the modern capitalistic society in the sense that surplus capital wherever it may be is seeking good investment; the loans spoken of in the text are mainly thought of as contracted for being invested productively in some business. The Śukranīti[4] advises a creditor to satisfy himself that the debtor is capable of transacting business even on loans with interest. It again advises that a creditor may advance money to a merchant who intends to start a business and dismissing from his mind the idea of interest should undertake business as his partner by

---

1. II.832-33.
2. II.834-35-Ṣaṣṭhāṃśaṃ vā caturthāṃśaṃ bhṛterbhṛtyasya pālayet. Dadyāt tadārdhaṃ vā bhṛtyāya dvitrivarṣe'khilaṃ tu vā
3. The amount of privilege leave admissible at one time is limited to three calender months - A Manual of Rules and Regulations applicable to members of the covenanted Civil Service of India compiled by C.H.Sampson (Calcutta, 1885), p.177 r.71. An officer on privilege leave is entitled to a leave allowance equal to the salary which he would receive if he were on duty in the appointment on which he has a lien- ibid., p.180 & r.76. Four per centum shall be deducted at the time of payment from every officer's pay. For rules about annuity see ibid., pp.218ff.
4. III.384-85.

sharing the profits equally.[1] In the case of a conquered territory the text suggests that after giving a maintenance grant to the conquered king, the conqueror may invest the remaining portion of the income from the conquered territory or its half at interest.[2] Elsewhere it observes that the king should always pay interest for the property belonging to the senseless, the blind and the infants.[3] Neither the legal texts nor the existing records indicate that in ancient times there was at any period such an acute demand for capital as to justify these novel rules in the Śukranīti. Then against the unanimous opinion of the legal works that the maximum interest admissible is equal to the principal itself,[4] which rule the Śukranīti itself gives[5] in another context, it is suggested[6] that a creditor could obtain from the debtor four times the principal. This second rule is not to be found in any other legal work.[7]

On the basis of the inclusion of zinc (raṅga) in the list of seven metals appearing in the Śukranīti[8], B.K.Sarkar[9], follow-

---

1. IV.5.630-Vṛddhiṃ hitvā hyardhadhanairvāṇijyaṃ kārayet sadā.
2. IV.7.806-7.
3. V.140-Jaḍāndhabāladravyāṇāṃ dadyādvṛddhiṃ nṛpassadā.
4. Gautama XII.28; Viṣṇu VI.11; Artha III.11; Manu VIII.151; Yāj II.39; Nārada IV.107; Kātyāyana 509.
5. IV.5.631-32.
6. V.192-93.
7. On loans of articles of use where the interest is to be paid in kind the total recoverable was eight, five, four or three times - Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, III pp.422f.
8. IV.2.173-75.
9. Positive Background of Hindu Sociology, Vol. I pp.114f.

ing the date for the introduction of zinc discussed by P.C.Ray, suggested the fourteenth century as one of the limits for the chronology of the text. Later on the text mentions jasada as another metal distinct from tin, lead and zinc.[1] This is evidently jastā, a zinc alloy or pewter, a modern Indian derivative of the Persian word jast. The term has no Sanskrit derivation and indicates a late date for the text.

The Śukranīti[2] seems to strike a modern note in economic principles in its discussion about mūlya (price). It defines the mūlya of a commodity as that by spending which one gets possession of the commodity, thus approaching the modern definition of price as the exchange value of a commodity. Prices of commodities are said here to be high or low according as they are easily available or not, their possessing properties (utility or power of satisfying wants) and their actual demand. In modern economic thought also these factors are emphasised.

The Śukranīti defines itihāsa as that science (vidyā) which narrates past events in and through the pretexts of the actions

---

1. IV.5.646-48, 658-59.
2. II.717-19-Yena vyayena saṃsiddhastadvyayastasya mūlyakaṃ.
Sulabhāsulabhatvāccāgunatvagunasamārayaiḥ.
Y-athākāmāt padārthānāmarthaṃ hīnādhikaṃ bhavet.

of kings.[1] The term itihāsa etymologically signifies an event of the past or a purāvṛtta being formed from iti + ha + āsa (so it really was). At first itihāsa was only one of the various possible and actually occurring forms of literary composition and in the later Sanskrit literature it simply means myth, legend, story and is frequently used in conjunction with, and as a synonym of, such common equivalents of story such as ākhyāna, ākhyāyikā and kathā.[2] Kauṭilya[3] explains itihāsa as a collective term including under it purāṇa, itivṛtta, ākhyāyikā, udāharaṇa, dharmaśāstra and arthaśāstra. In the Mahābhārata itihāsa is defined as an event of olden time, conjoined with a tale and provided with a demonstration of duty, profit, love and final emancipation[4] which thus emphasises its didactic sense under its narrative guise. A verse quoted by Śrīdharasvāmin in his commentary on the Viṣṇu Purāṇa[5] defines itihāsa as containing detailed accounts as told by sages and others, lives of gods and seers

---

1. IV.3.102-3-Prāgvṛttakathanaṃ caikarājyakṛtyamiṣāditaḥ.
   Yasmin sa itihāsassyāt purāvṛttassa eva hi.
2. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, s.v., itihāsa. Cf. JBORS, X p.327.
3. I.5 (p.10)-Paścimamitihāsaśravaṇe. Purāṇamitivṛttamākhyāyikodāharaṇaṃ dharmaśāstramarthaśāstraṃ cetītihāsaḥ.
4. Dharmārthakāmamokṣāṇāṃ upadeśasamanvitam.
   Pūrvavṛttaṃ kathāyuktamitihāsaṃ pracakṣate. q. in V.M.Apte's Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary Revised by P.K.Gode and C.G.Karve (Poona, 1957), s.v., itihāsa.
5. III.4.10-Ārṣyādibahuvyākhyānaṃ devarṣicaritāśrayam.
   Itihāsamiti proktaṃ bhaviṣyādbhutadharmayuk.

and wonderful pious stories of the future. The conception of itihāsa in the Śukranīti is not in line with its descriptions and definitions found in other early texts. It is very near to the conception of history derived from the western sources prevailing in the early years of the nineteenth century and placing an over-emphasis on political details as against social and cultural history which has come to be considered important only recently.

There are indications to suggest that the Śukranīti does not believe in the old ideal of the laws in the sacred texts having lasting validity; on the contrary it speaks of the law undergoing frequent changes and of the new enactments overriding the śāstric injunctions. Thus it describes the duty of the officer called Paṇḍita as being to study the laws obtaining in society in ancient and modern times, those that have been ordained in sacred texts, those now opposed and those which militate against the customs of the people.[1] Later on it says that owing to the difference in the opinion of new and old authorities on law, law is undergoing changes every moment.[2] The Śukranīti seems to represent the view-point of the early British legislators and administrators who recognised the authority of the Smṛti laws without treating them as eternally valid and transformed

---

1. II.200-202-Vartamānāśca prācīnā dharmāḥ ke lokasamśritāḥ.
Śāstreṣu ke samuddiṣṭā virudhyaṃte ca ke'dhunā.
Lokaśāstraviruddhāḥ ke paṃditastān vicintya ca.

2. III.648-49-Nūtanaprāktanānāṃ ca vyavahāravidāṃ dhiyā.
Pratikṣaṇaṃ cābhinavo vyavahāro bhavedataḥ.

them or replaced them by new laws if they went against their own ideals and concepts and the customs and practices of long standing among different social groups.[1]

In its treatment of the caste system the Śukranīti reveals a characteristically modern and realistic approach.[2] It refers to the division of the society into four varṇas[3], and to there being an infinitude of castes owing to their inter-mixtures, both anuloma and pratiloma[4], but it is not at all concerned with the theory of castes and its corollary explaining the other social, functional and ethnic groups as resulting from the union of particular males and females. The latter especially claims much space in earlier legal texts but the Śukranīti with its realistic approach simply brushes aside the theoretic explanation by not giving any detailed consideration to it. It says that in ancient times the castes were divided into four classes by Brahmā according to their activities.[5] Thus though it accepts the four-fold

---

1. Cf. Kātyāyana vv.35-51. It has been argued by J.D.M.Derrett (Law and Custom in Ancient India: Sources and Authority to be published in Rev.Int.Dr.Ant., 1962 or 1963) that law in India was not immutable. It is however to be emphasised that though in practice some of the smṛti rules could be rendered obsolete or be made to yield different meanings, no orthodox Hindu jurist concedes the possibility of the śāstra being open to amendment by legislation. See Manu I.21 with Medhātithi.
2. Cf. V.S.Bendrey, Daṇḍanīti, Introduction, pp.52, 58f, 67 for the caste system in the seventeenth century and Shivaji's policy in selecting officers.
3. II.868; IV.3.21; IV.4.66-68.
4. IV.3.22-23; also II.868.
5. IV.3.21. It uses jāti in place of varṇa.

division as divinely ordained it does not repeat any of the justification or explanation offered in earlier texts but says that the division was made according to the activities of the groups. Just after mentioning that the division into four classes was made in ancient times by Brahmā it refers to the infinitude of castes, difficult to explain, resulting from their intermixture. This suggests that the Śukranīti treats the four-fold division as nothing but a myth or philosophical fiction. Probably the author of the Śukranīti indulges in sarcasm in adding that those alone who regard caste differences as due to birth know the differences in their names and occupations.[1] Elsewhere he openly discards the generally accepted view that birth is the test of castes and describes the castes in the terms of their virtues and occupations and enumerates the various qualities of each caste.[2] The Śukranīti reflects a general weakening of the rigours of the caste system. It says that by the qualities and occupations high and low orders are created in course of time[3] and the castes are named after their respective learning and occupation.[4] According to the Śukranīti family and caste are to be considered only in marriage and dining.[5] Work, character and merit are to

---

1. IV.3.24-25-Manyante jātibhedaṃ ye manuṣyānāṃ tu janmanā.
Ta eva hi vijānaṃti pārthakyaṃ nāmakarmabhiḥ.
2. I.75-88.
3. IV.3.29-Karmaṇottamanīcatvaṃ kālatastu bhavedguṇaiḥ.
4. IV.3.30-Vidyākalāśrayeṇaiva tannāmnā jātirucyate.
5. II.113-Vivāhe bhojane nityaṃ kulajātivivecanaṃ.

be respected and superiority is not asserted by caste or family.[1] Hence in appointing councillors one must not notice only the caste or family.[2] After enumerating the qualities to be sought in councillors the text says that men having these qualities should be appointed irrespective of their caste.[3] Elsewhere also it advises the king to appoint from all castes men having requisite qualities to different offices.[4] It does not subscribe to the view that certain occupations are the monopoly of special castes. Thus though preferring a kṣatriya or brāhmaṇa as commander of the forces, it says that the commander is to be selected from any caste and goes on to add that fighting is the duty of the four main castes as well as of the mixed castes.[5] ~~In an earlier context it has already advised that commander is to be selected from any caste and goes on to add that fighting is the duty of the four main castes as well as of the mixed castes.~~ In an earlier context it has already advised that commanders and soldiers are to be selected from any of the castes.[6] The caste groups display much elasticity in the matter of occupations in the sense that over and above their traditional duties[7] the text speaks of many other occupations as legitimate

1. II.III-12.
2. II.110
3. II.333-36.
4. IV.5.33-34.
5. II.865-68.
6. II.276-80.
7. IV.3.31-35.

for the different castes.[1]

Oppert[2] compiled a long list of passages found in Sanskrit works identical with, and parallel to, verses contained in the Śukranīti. It would appear that the author of the Śukranīti took many verses, often verbatim, from a number of sources including the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, Manu, Nārada, Yājñavalkya, Viṣṇu and Parāśara smṛtis, the Mitākṣarā, the Hitopadeśa and the Pañcatantra. In several places the Śukranīti uses many and long passages from the Kāmandakīya. Of these in any case the passages found in the Kāmandakīya also were obviously borrowed and cannot be explained in any other fashion. The author of the Kāmandakīya[3] explicitly confesses that his work is of the nature of a scholar's compilation based primarily on the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya and that he collects the views of Kauṭilya under convenient titles; hence it does not seem likely that he would have taken so many passages from the Śukranīti without any acknowledgement.

Another point which also incidentally suggests the possible date of the Śukranīti is that, apart from the indirect points of resemblance through the

---

1. IV.3.37; II.862-64.
2. Śukranīti, pp.246-81.
3. II.2-8.

Kāmandakīya which borrows from the Arthaśāstra, the Śukranīti is not aware of the contents of the work of Kauṭilya. We cannot trace any significant parallels between the two works which is all the more important as the ground covered by the two works is almost identical. To illustrate our point we may say that the Śukranīti, though it is monarchistic, does not think in terms of state-conducted enterprise, industry and commerce whereas the Arthaśāstra conception of state is that of an active participation in economic production. This omission is to be explained by the fact that the text of the Arthaśāstra was lost to Indians and it was through the chance discovery by R.Shamasastry in 1904 that the world came to know this text. It was therefore natural for the Śukranīti to be free from the influences of the Arthaśāstra, if the former is a nineteenth century composition.[1]

---

1. The Sanskrit commentaries on the Arthaśāstra also do not seem to have formed a source for the present Śukranīti. These commentaries are limited in number and so are their manuscript copies. The Nītinirṇīti commentary by Yogghama is known only from one manuscript from the Jain Bhandaras at Pattan. These Bhandaras were not accessible to earlier scholars and the existence of this manuscript was not known before 1937 when C.D.Dalal and L.B.Gandhi noticed it. The commentaries Pratipadapañcikā by Bhaṭṭasvāmin and Nayacandrikā by Mādhavayajvan were used by R.Shamasastry. The original source of the manuscripts of these commentaries in the Madras Government Oriental Library was a palm leaf manuscript from Kerala. See P.K.Gode, Studies in Indian Literary History, Vol. I pp. 144ff. These commentaries are in fragments and do not cover the entire text of the Arthaśāstra. There is no significant parallel between the contents of the Śukranīti and those of the extant commentaries of the Arthaśāstra.

This much is clear from references in early Indian works that Śukra or the preceptor of the demons was regarded as one of the hoary sages venerated as authorities on polity. But this in no way implies that the present Śukranīti[1] can be taken as the original work of Śukra. It is very likely that in early times there was a work which passed under his name or that certain views were traditionally ascribed to him. In order to establish the authenticity of the Śukranīti Oppert[2] compared certain references to the views of Uśanas in the Mahābhārata, Harivaṁśa, Pañcatantra and Kāmandakīya with those in the present text of the Śukranīti. It is to be noted that in no references given by Oppert do we find the name of the text as Śukranīti; on the contrary Uśanas was the more usual form of the name of the sage than Śukra. It is significant that there is no single reference to or quotation from the Śukranīti in any of the commentaries and digests of the early medieval period.[3] The earliest work to cite the nīti or rajanīti of Śukra is the Rājanītiratnākara of

---

1. Pañcatantra I.2; Mbh., Rājadharma 58.1-4 and 59.76-87 (Under the name of Kāvya); Kāmandaka II.4-5 (Uśanas). Also Arthaśāstra (tr), p.1.
2. On the Weapons, Army Organisation, and Political Maxims of the Ancient Hindus (Madras, 1880), pp.37-41. Also Śukraniti, Preface, p. vi.
3. Yuktikalpataru, p.2, makes only a general reference to Auśanasi-niti.

Caṇḍeśvara.[1] But these quotations cannot be traced in the available text of the Śukranīti. This fact may also be utilised for determining the date of the available text of the Śukranīti. The Rājanītiratnākara was composed in the fourteenth century but came to light in 1918. The text does not appear to have been much known outside Bihar from where come its manuscripts.[2] Obviously we cannot expect the author of the Śukranīti to know the Rājanītiratnākara if the former is regarded as a nineteenth century composition.

To prove that the Śukranīti existed in the eleventh century B.P.Mazumdar[3] has pointed out that ten verses from the work of Bhārgava as quoted in the Nītikalpataru[4] ascribed to Kṣemendra can be traced to the printed edition of the Śukranīti.[5] We have found that two more verses quoted in the Nītikalpataru[6] as being from the work of Bhārgava also appear in the Śukranīti.[7] V.P.Mahajan[8]

---

1. pp. 42, 70, 72, 76f.
2. Rājanītiratnākara, Introduction, pp. 9-10.
3. Socio-Economic History of Northern India, Preface, p.xi. See Nītikalpataru, pp. 278f.
4. pp. 193f.(section 98 vv. 52-61).
5. IV.7.248-70 leaving 11,255, 258. Some of the lines interchange their position in the Śukranīti. The second line of v.60 in the Nītikalpataru does not appear in the Śukranīti. The first line of v.61 of the Nītikalpataru can be recognised in 1.256 of the Śukranīti. Other variations in reading are minor ones and are negligible.
6. p.185 (section 97A vv.16-17).
7. IV.7.77-78, 83-84.
8. Introduction, p. xi. Prof. Raghavan (Op. cit., p.6, f.n.9) points out that the Nītikalpataru underwent amplification up to the time of Maharajah Ranbir Singh of Kashmir.

who has edited the Nītikalpataru has grave and legitimate doubts about Kṣemendra being the author or compiler-editor of the Nīti-kalpataru. He regards the Nītikalpataru, like the Lokaprakāśa, as a work of a later date attributed to Kṣemendra to gain sanction and authority for it. Even if some original verses and a part of the commentary are ascribed to Kṣemendra, the text in its present form contains so many additions of a late date that it is difficult to determine the portions which can be definitely ascribed to Kṣemendra. Of the ten verses quoted in the Nīti-kalpataru v.52 seems to be ascribed to Varāhācārya, verses 52 to 57 and the first line of verse 58 to Uśanas and the second line of verse 58 and verses 59 to 61 to Bhārgava. The fact that, even though the verses are continuous in sense, the author of the Nītikalpataru had to bring in the name of Bhārgava as distint from Uśanas from whom ŧ he was quoting, clearly indicates that he treated these as two different authors. Hence it would follow that the Nītikalpataru did not borrow these verses from one single source i.e., the Śukranīti. We may suggest that the Śukranīti and the Nītikalpataru were alike drawing from the same common source.

It therefore appears likely that as the nineteenth century writer of the Śukranīti had a good knowledge of Sanskrit he could very well have known the references to Uśanas in famous

works like the Mahābhārata, Harivaṁśa, Pañcatantra and Kāmandakīya and deliberately incorporated them in his composition to give it an air of authenticity.[1]

We thus find that the present Śukranīti was the work of a man of the nineteenth century who had a thorough knowledge of the regulations, administrative measures and policies of the East India Company, especially those of the Bombay coast and was well-informed on Maratha history.[2] He knew the ancient Sanskrit texts on the subject well and drew upon them to complete his account and impart it an ancient character. It is not unlikely that he had in his possession a copy of an old Śukranīti in some form, though the text appears to have early receded from public study and attention. But he completely transformed the nature of the text.

The striking parallelism between our text and the East India Company Regulations of the first quarter of the nineteenth century would suggest that its composition has to be placed towards the end of the first half of the nineteenth century. A

---

1. Prof. Raghavan (Op.cit., p.16) has noticed that copies of similar Nīti texts in the Oppert collection and ascribed to Ṛṣabha, Nārada and Kṛṣṇārjuna are really extracts made from the dialogues associated with these names in the different parts of the Mahābhārata.
2. We feel that many other details in the text which do not occur in other ancient texts could be traced if a thorough search is made of the history, administrative system, social institutions and military organisation under the early rule of the East India Company, especially in the Bombay Presidency and under Shivaji and other Marathas.

study of the existing manuscripts of the text yields an upper limit for its date. All the dated manuscripts belong to the third quarter of the nineteenth century, two of the earliest ones from the Oriental Institute, Baroda and the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras being respectively dated in 1851 and 1852.

It is difficult to speak of the motives which actuated the modern writer of the Śukranīti. He may have aimed at appeasing a liberal Sahab who was interested in unearthing lost Sanskrit texts.[1] By presenting a polity in conformity with the practices of the East India Company he may have wanted to earn the good will of his officers, or else in a patriotic spirit wished to trace some of the details of the administrative machinery of the East India Company back to ancient India.

Speaking about the Śukranīti as a spurious text Prof. Raghavan has pointed out that its "suspect-character" "is strengthened by a regular group of such texts which were palmed off on poor credulous Gustav Oppert[2]". But as regards the Śukranīti the stricture on Oppert is misplaced. Long before Oppert first took any notice of this text it had been publicised by others. It was not Oppert but his predecessor Mr. Śeṣagiri Śāstrī who bought

---

1. Cf. K.A.N.Sastri in his review of B.P.Mazumdar's Socio-Economic History - J.I.H., 1961.
2. Op. cit., p.16.

a copy of its manuscript for the Government Manuscripts Library, Madras as far back as 1871[1]. In the year 1882, which saw the publication of the Śukranīti by Oppert, another independent edition was brought out by J.Vidyāsāgara from Calcutta. Even before that in 1876 an edition was published from Alibagh under the orders of the Holkar king Tukojīrāo. Manuscripts of this text are not confined to Madras, but are reported from different parts of India.

These manuscripts further suggest that in the second half of the nineteenth century the present text of the Śukranīti was not regarded as a forgery in the modern sense of the term. The legal traditions in India reveal flexibility in the sense that the commentaries and digests which became fashionable in the post-Harṣa period aimed at adopting the laws to changed conditions from time to time by new interpretations, arrangement or cataloguing with a particular emphasis in view.[2] A work of this kind was often produced under a certain ruler, who in some cases is specifically said to have ordered its composition, and it was

---

1. G.Oppert, On the Weapons, Army Organisation, and Political Maxims of the Ancient Hindus (Madras, 1880), p.43, f.n. 82.
2. The Daṇḍanīti by Keśava-paṇḍita (Ed. V.S.Bendrey, Poona, 1943) was written in the seventeenth century under the early Maratha rulers for interpreting the ancient legal rules and emphasising them according to the changed conditions.

meant to guide him on legal issues. The Śukranīti differs from these medieval legal writings in that it is presented as an original work, and not in the form of a commentary or a digest, and does not refer to its composition as being ordered by any particular king. In this respect the Śukranīti seems to be in the tradition of the smṛtis known under the name of Manu, Yājñavalkya and other sages. It is well known that these smṛtis in the form in which they are now available cannot be the work of sages whose names are associated with them. These works were evidently not forgeries in the modern sense, and, as with the pseudepigraphical literature of other ancient societies, the names of the sages were prefixed to give the texts an air of authority. Likewise the author of the present Śukranīti cannot be charged with forgery. He produced a nīti text and made it up-to-date by incorporating even the most recent information, and used the name of Śukra because of his reputaion as one of the foremost authorities on nīti[1], according to an ancient convention which even in his own day had not wholly disappeared.

---

1. Śukra is regarded as the guru of the demons. We wonder if the modern writer of the Śukranīti deliberately used the name of Śukra with the implication that the present age with so many Yavanas, including Muslims and Europeans, is a very advanced stage of Kali age when the preceptor of the demons had the greatest claim for being recognised as the chief authority.

This type of Sanskrit composition was very common during the early British rule. The British patronised Sanskrit scholars and encouraged them to prepare legal treatises for the use of the British government. Whereas some of these works were certainly or almost certainly produced at the request of the British, others were written in response to the new situation created by the method of British administration.[1] It is interesting to note that some of these Sanskrit jurists like Jagannātha assimilated some of the constitutional changes and adjusted the Indian legal tradition to some of the developments initiated by the British administration. It would appear that the present Śukranīti was also composed with a desire to incorporate certain features of the administration under the East India Company to the account preserved in the traditional Indian works on the subject.

We can suggest another motive for the production of such a work. It is well known that the East India Company often took charge of the administration of its subordinate rulers on the pretext that they were not efficient and just. It might be that some such Indian ruler, by combining something of the East India Company's administration with ancient Indian practices, wished to convey the impression that his administration was based on

---

1. J.D.M.Derrett, Sanskrit Legal Treatises compiled at the instance of the British in Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft for 1961 pp. 72-117.

sound and just principles.

At Tanjore in the first half of the nineteenth century we find many conditions and factors which could create the necessary mood and also the ability to undertake the production of the present Śukranīti. Several generations of the Mahārājas of Tanjore had earned a reputation for their attempt to fashion their administration after the strict orthodox tradition.[1] The greatest of these rulers was Mahārāja Serfoji (1800-1832 A.D.), followed by Shivaji (1832-1855 A.D.). Serfoji founded the Sarasvatī Mahāl Library which still treasures valuable ancient works. He patronised many scholars and started sabhās, called Dharmasabhā, Nyāyasabhā and Mudrĭtasabhā, manned by paṇḍits for passing authoritative opinion on disputed points of law and religion. Four works are ascribed to him, of which the Smṛti-saṅgraha and the Smṛtisārasamuccaya are legal treatises. The Tanjore court employed the services of many paṇḍits for undertaking legal research and the compilation and codification of legal treatises.[2] On controversial legal issues the East India Company often solicited the opinion of these paṇḍits. It is well known that the East India Company made several attempts to

---

1. J.D.M.Derrett, Op. cit., p. 102.
2. Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS in the Tanjore Library, Vol. XIX, Introduction, pp. xi-xii.

annex the state of Tanjore on different pretexts, ultimately succeeding in its designs. It may be conjectured that the Tanjore Mahārājas whose administration was based on the orthodox system wished to suggest that this was not arbitrary but was based on principles similar to those of the East India Company. The Tahjore Mahārājas were Maratha rulers, which explains the intimate knowledge of Maratha history and polity reflected in the Śukranīti. But unfortunately the Sarasvatī Mahāl Library does not seem to have any manuscript copy of the text to establish this suggested origin.

As the facts stand it appears more probable that the text originated in the Maratha state of Baroda. It is significant that the earliest dated manuscript of the Śukranīti (1851 A.D.) comes from Baroda. This would also suit the fact that the Śukranīti reveals closer affinities to the Bombay Regulations of the East India Company than to those from Bengal or Madras.

The known manuscripts of the text as referred to in the Catalogues are as follows:

1. An Alphabetical List of Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute, Baroda (Baroda, 1950) vol. II, p.1096 - dated Sam. 1908 (A.D. 1851).
2. Alphabetical Index of Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library Madras (Madras, 1893), p.97. In the Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Govern-

ment Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, Vol. VIII pp. 2937-39 the manuscript is described as being in Devanāgarī characters. According to the colophon a certain Veṅkaṭeśa got it copied - Likhāyatam (sic) Veṅkateśa-viduṣā Bhārate pure (probably for Bharatpur ?). It is dated in Sam. 1909 (A.D. 1852).

3. A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts contained in the Private Libraries of Gujarat, Kathiavad, Kachchh, Sindh, and Khandes. G. Bühler (Bombay, 1871-73) Vol. No. III p. 128 no. 346 - dated (V.S.) 1917 (A.D. 1860); in the possession of Maṅgalaśaṅkara of Ahamadabad.

4. Catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office. Compiled by A.B.Keith (Oxford, 1935), No. 5435. Neatly written in the Telugu character in A.D 1867. According to a note on p.216 it was written by Veṃkaṭasubbaya and corrected by Burnell's scribe Veṃkaṭasubbā Śāstrin. Cf. Veṃkateśa mentioned in No. 2.

5. Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of Southern India by G.Oppert (Madras, 1880-85), No. 7501 - in the possession of Ciravūru Rāmasomayājūlu of Vijayanagaram.

6. Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts by Rajendralala Mitra (Calcutta, 1871-90), No. 1828. The copy at Calcutta is described as in Nāgara character. A second copy is said to have been with Bābū Rāmadāsa Sena of Berhampur.

7. Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts existing in Oudh. Compiled by Paṇḍit Deviprasada (1880), XIII p. 118 - in Nāgarī characters;

in the possession of Munshi Kali Prasad of Lucknow.

8. As above. (1885) XVIII p. 94 - in Nāgarī characters; in the possession of Pandita Nandarāma of Gonda.

9. A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of the North-Western Provinces (Allahabad, 1877-86), Part V p.50- in Devanāgarī character; in the possession of Munshi Kali Prasad of Lucknow. It is different from no. 7.

10. Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of his H ighness the Mahārāja of Ulwar by P.Peterson (Bombay, 1892), no. 1488.

11. Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Raghunatha Temple Library of his Highness the Mahārāja of Jammu and Kashmir. M.A.Stein (Bombay, 1894), p.105.

Because of its interesting contents the Śukranīti early attracted the attention of printers. Here we mention some of the published editions found in the India Office Library.

1. Śrī-Śukranīti with Marathi transliteration in verse done by Ve.Śā.Śṃpanna Gaṇapatī Bovā alias Bālāsāheba Saṃsthāna Sāṃvera. Published by Rāmacandra Govinda Śāstrī under the orders of Śrīmaṃta Mahārāja Tukojīrāva Holakara Sarakāra Bahādūra (Satyasadana Press, Alibagh). There are two copies of the text one of which is specifically mentioned as second edition. The I.O.L. Catalogue gives the dates for the two respectively as 1876 and 1879. Recently a second copy of the first edition has been catalogued in the Library as San.D.2364 without recognising its

identity. Oppert in his work On the Weapons, Army Organisation, and Political Maxims of the Ancient Hindus, p.43 f.n. 82, mentions this work as having been "published a few years ago ".

2. Śukranītisāra Vol.I. Text, variae lectiones, etc. Ed. G.Oppert (Government Press, Madras, 1882).

3. Śukranītivyākhyā. Ed. with a commentary by Jibananda Vidyasagara (Sarasvati Press, Calcutta, 1882).

4. Śukranīti (with Bengali translation). Ed. Dāsakumāra Caṭṭopādhyāya, Adhyāya I only (Metropolitan Press, Calcutta, 1883).

5. Śukranītivyākhyā (with Bengali translation). Ed. Gurucaraṇa Bhaṭṭācāryya (Metropolitan Press, Calcutta, 1885).

6. Śukranīti with Hindi translation by Babu Padmadeva N.Pandeya. Adhyāyas I-III only (Medical Hall Press, Benares, 1889).

7. Śukranīti with Hindi translation by Paṃḍita Mihiracandrajī (Śrī Veṃkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay, 1895).

8. Śukranīti with Gujarati translation by Jechārāma Sūryarāma Deśāī (Gujarati Printing Press, Bombay, 1912). 2nd. edn. The Preface mentions that the first edition was brought out in 1893.

Of all these printed editions only that by Oppert mentions the manuscripts used and also the variant readings. Those published after 1882 were probably based on either Oppert or Jibananda Vidyasagara or both. This appears likely in the case of the Gujarati edition by Jechārāma Sūryarāma Deśāī, who does not seem to have possessed any copy of the manuscript of the

Śukranīti[1]. We know of two manuscripts from Bengal, either or both of which served as the source for Jibananda Vidyasagara. But we do not know anything about the manuscript used for the Marathi edition from Holkar state.

---

1. See the Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Itchharam Suryaram Desai Collection in the Library of the University of Bombay. Compiled by H.D.Velankar (Bombay, 1953).